

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

JUNE, 1847.

ART. I.—1. *The Church of England cleared from the charge of Schism, upon testimonies of Councils and Fathers of the first six centuries.* By THOMAS WILLIAM ALLIES, M. A., Rector of Launton, Oxon. Burns, London.

2.—*The Unity of the Episcopate Considered, in reply to the work of the Rev. T. W. Allies, M. A.* By EDWARD HEALY THOMPSON, M. A. Richardson, London, Dublin, and Derby.

3.—*The Greek and Anglican Communion. A Letter respectfully addressed to the Rev. T. W. Allies, Rector of Launton.* By P. LE PAGE RENOUF, late of Pembroke College, Oxford. Toovey, London.

4.—*Tentativa Theologica. Episcopal Rights and Ultra-montane Usurpations.* By FATHER ANTONIO PEREIRA DE FIGUEREDO, Priest and Doctor of Lisbon. Translated from the original Portuguese, with Notes and some additional matter, by the Rev. E. H. Landon, M. A. Masters, London.

5.—*Notes on the Nature and Extent of the Royal Supremacy in the Anglican Church.* By DAVID LEWIS, M. A. Toovey, London.

6.—*A Few Earnest Thoughts on the Duty of Communion with the Catholic Church, addressed affectionately to an Anglican friend.* By a Recent Convert. Richardson, London, Dublin, and Derby.

WE have never in our memory read a controversial work on the anti-catholic side, which has so much pleased us in its general temper and spirit as Mr. Allies's volume; and we rejoice to observe that it has been met by Mr. Thompson with a kindred feeling. "The tone and style in which Mr. Allies writes," observes his opponent, "are not only every way superior to that of ordinary controversialists, but

worthy of the admiration of all serious and earnest men. The candour, honesty, and generosity, which he so remarkably displays, must command the respect and sympathy of his readers, especially of those [i. e. the recent converts] of whom he has spoken with so much equity and kindness." (p. 15.) "I have seen the eyes of Catholics glistening with pleasure and hopeful interest at the reading of" a certain earnest expression of feeling on Mr. Allies's part. (p. 180.) Mr. Renouf also, though only having seen an extract from the work, expresses himself with great personal respect towards the writer. It is truly delightful to find that the heartless and most shallow criticism to which Catholics have so constantly been subject, has in no way made them insensible to real generosity and an open-hearted search for truth, when such qualities are brought before them. And we are the more anxious ourselves to express our sympathy with the *moral* aspect of Mr. Allies's work, because (to say truth) we have the meanest possible opinion of its *intellectual*.

Mr. Thompson's work contains a careful and accurate statement of principles; and also an application of them well and thoroughly worked out, to the purpose he has had in view: that purpose being twofold, viz. an interpretation of those particular facts or general features in church history on which Mr. Allies rests his attack on Catholics, and an exposure both of the baselessness and the inconsistency of that gentleman's *positive* doctrinal statements. Mr. Renouf's pamphlet, on the other hand, has no pretensions to be considered an answer to the work in question, which the author, indeed, had no means of seeing as a whole; it is an effective and complete refutation of an episodic argument, introduced by Mr. Allies into his earnest and eloquent peroration—an argument, however, which, although but subordinate to Mr. Allies's general train of reasoning, is yet, as Mr. Renouf truly remarks, "more likely than any other part of it to weigh with some minds in retaining them within the communion of the Church of England." Mr. Renouf, in short, has produced a very able, popular, and effective pamphlet, peculiarly seasonable and peculiarly valuable at the present time: but Mr. Thompson's treatise is still more than this; it is a permanent addition to theological literature, and it will exceedingly well repay, what is requisite indeed for its due apprehension and appreciation, a careful and attentive study.

Of the three other works named at the outset, we have thought it advisable to mention Mr. Landon's translation of Pereira's "*Tentativa*," because it has been published in direct connection with Mr. Allies's treatise and on a precisely similar subject, and also because one or two particulars of its history are amusingly significant; but we have been quite unable to find in it any argument beyond the thrice-repeated common-place of the old Gallican controversy, such as Mr. Allies also has put together. Mr. Lewis' pamphlet is only connected with the preceding productions by the rule of contraries; seeing he has carried the war into the enemy's country, and instead of defending the Roman Supremacy, has mainly occupied himself with exposing the real nature of that which the Anglican Church has endured in its place. He has stated indeed, in his Introduction, with great calmness and force, the position held by the Catholic Church in relation to other religious communities; but the body of his work is composed of quite an invaluable collection of extracts from Anglican authoritative documents, illustrating the real nature of the ecclesiastical proceedings which have taken place in that unhappy body since its separation from Catholic unity. The little work which stands last on the list, explains its own object by its title; and is remarkable for its particularly clear and popular way of stating arguments, in themselves most solid and cogent.

Of the work, then, which has given occasion to the present controversy, we are unable to speak highly, in respect either of depth or comprehensiveness of view; and when we speak of Mr. Thompson's service in answering its allegations, it is not because Mr. Allies's *conclusions* are in any way formidable, but because the facts which he has brought together might be used by a deeper thinker than himself, and pressed into the service of a cause which Mr. Allies abhors as cordially as we abhor it. At the same time, utterly untenable though we consider Mr. Allies's position, it is one for which, in one respect, we feel the sincerest sympathy, and in behalf of which we are willing to make the utmost allowance. He is not one of those who refuse to admit that holiness is holiness or unity is unity, for fear such an admission should charm them from their insular and exclusive sympathies. He opens his eyes to see, and his heart to admire, what is beautiful and attractive in the Roman Church; he gladly recognizes the marks she bears

of special divine help and of a special divine presence; but he is withholden from yielding to his first feeling of reverence and submitting to her claims, by what appears to him a still higher and diviner authority. Such has, before now, been the feeling of many who have been led by divine guidance, step by step, out of the labyrinth in which they were placed; such may possibly be still the feeling of many besides Mr. Allies, who as yet distrust the clue that has been proffered for their extrication. But what Catholic can entertain any feelings but those of sympathy and affectionate hope, in behalf of one who could so express himself as in the following passage?

“That power for which the heroic and saintly Hildebrand died in exile, if exile there could be to him who received the heathen for his inheritance and the utmost parts of the earth for his possession; for which our own St. Anselm, forced against his will to the primacy, stood unquailing in the path of the Red King, most furious if not the worst of that savage race, whose demon wrath seemed to justify the fable of their origin; for which St. Bernard, the last of the Fathers in age but equal to the first in glory, wrote and laboured; for which our own St. Thomas shed that noble blood, which sanctifies yet our primatial church, an earnest of restoration and pardon to come; that power for which St. Francis, the spouse of holy poverty, so long neglected since her first husband ascended on high; and St. Dominic,.... *and one greater yet, the warrior Saint Ignatius*, raised their myriads of every age and of both sexes, armed in that triple mail of poverty, chastity and obedience, ‘of whom the world was not worthy;’ that power to which have borne witness so many saintly bishops, poor in the midst of [riches,]* and humble in the exercise of more than royal power,—so many scholars marvellously learned—so many prodigal of labour and blood, who are now counted among the noble army of martyrs—so many holy women *who have hidden themselves under the robe of the first of all saints, and followed the Virgin of virgins in their degree*—that power is indeed the most wondrous creation which history can record, and one to which I am not ashamed to confess that I should bow with unmingled reverence, had not truth a yet stronger claim upon me, and *did not the voice of the early church, its fathers councils, and martyrs, sound distinctly in my ears another language*. Still human and divine, ambition and providence, are so mingled there, that I would not utter a word more than truth requires.”—p. 192.

Such language as this must of course act powerfully in

* In the original, apparently by a clerical error, the word “poverty” stands here.

drawing Catholic minds towards one who uses it; and we earnestly hope no strength of expression we may use in criticizing the work in which it is contained, may be taken to imply that we are insensible to the rare candour and other high qualities which it indicates. In fact, the intense dislike which we fairly profess to entertain towards the reasoning of Mr. Allies's work, arises in no small degree from vexation that so paltry a theory can have the power to detain one moment a mind, apparently well fitted for a far worthier and higher position. Even as to the quotation we just made—though it is not worth while dwelling long on minor inconsistencies where the whole work is pervaded by one uninterrupted logical flaw—but how does the author's language about "St. Bernard, equal to the first of the Fathers in glory," and "St. Francis, the spouse of holy poverty, *so long neglected*," and "*one greater yet*, St. Ignatius Loyola," and "the myriads of every age and of both sexes," raised up by them, "of whom the world was not worthy"—how does all this, we ask, fall in with his judgment expressed only seven pages later, (p. 199.) that, since the "separation of East and West," the several parts, "Latin, Eastern, and Anglican," are "languishing, and far from that healthy vigour which they ought to possess?" St. Bernard, though "equal to the first of the Fathers," lived subsequently to the conversion of Russia; an event which Mr. Allies's chronology dates after the final Eastern schism. St. Francis, who lived after the same schism, was "the spouse of holy poverty, *so long neglected* since" our Lord's Ascension; and therefore, at all events, not so heartily embraced before the said schism as after. Nay, St. Ignatius lived not till a still later period in this disastrous progress of decay, as Mr. Allies would term it, nor until "the Anglican branch" also separated from the parent tree; yet he was "greater yet" than St. Francis or St. Dominic: nay, he too, as well as these former members of a "languishing" Church, "raised up myriads of whom the world was not worthy." And the very page to which we have been referring for this inconsistency, presents us also with another. For the author comments (p. 199) on those "who have suffered themselves to be driven by fearful scandals out of our bosom, who have brooded over acknowledged, but unrelieved, wants, till the duty of patient long suffering has been forgotten." So speaks Mr. Allies—he, the same writer, who began his

work with the equitable and generous avowal, that, "to talk of impatience under 'deficiencies, [under] want of discipline, or [under want of] sympathy in spiritual superiors, and such like causes, as being those which have impelled a man to the most painful sacrifices.....is surely *untrue as regards the individual*.....when the ground of schism... ..is felt to lie at the bottom." (p.11.) We might expose similar contradictions in a number of other places, but it is better to enter without further delay into the heart of the subject; nor should we indeed have spoken of these, except to show samples of what we are compelled to call the "slipshod" style in which the whole work is written. The author has taken no pains to form a definite judgment on the matter in hand, and to preserve in his mind the habitual impressions of that judgment; but has allowed his imagination to follow up whatever train of feeling suggested itself at the moment, careless what sacrifice of reality and consistency might be the result.

Now be it carefully observed that, when we speak of the work under notice as shallow, we are far from implying (the very contrary indeed) that it is any mark of shallowness, to find considerable difficulty at the outset in reconciling the present Roman* theory with the facts of church history. It is not because he finds difficulty in the Roman doctrine, but because he finds no difficulty in his own, that we so speak of his reasonings. The Roman doctrine may have its *primâ facie* historical difficulties; but of Mr. Allies's theory one would hardly say it is encumbered with *difficulties*, rather it is wild and extravagant beyond all power of comment; setting common sense and the most ordinary and well-known facts equally at defiance. And this allegation we are now to make good.

But let us first explain our admission, that there are difficulties which even the Catholic student of church history will meet at starting; for this is a subject on which it is very important there should be a right understanding. *All* history is, on the surface, difficult and perplexing;

* We occasionally use the word "Roman" in controversy with Mr. Allies, after Mr. Thompson's example, as not wishing to beg the question by assuming the very designation which is in dispute.

Were church history, indeed, the Catholic's *rule of faith*, why should we expect church history to be an exception? as it seems to be Mr. Allies's,* the question would be very different; but there is no one statement on which all the great Catholic doctors are more unanimous than on this, that, not individual study of ancient records, but the living voice of the Church, is the appointed interpreter of Apostolic Tradition. The notion opposed to this has been, indeed, mainly introduced into theology by Anglican "high-church" writers; though we cannot deny that Bossuet and some of his Gallican followers may have unconsciously admitted it into their thoughts and reasonings. The Catholic's faith, we say it again and again, in no way depends upon his knowledge of the Fathers. God forbid! Even of priests, how large a number are able to attempt any systematic and continuous study of the patristic writings? Notoriously an exceedingly minute fraction: such study is absolutely incompatible with the duties of an active missionary life. Has the zealous and energetic priest, then, who is ready to give his life, if need be, as a sacrifice for his flock,—or, again, has the pious and devout layman, who carries a watchful heart and an ever-burning love of God into the pressing and arduous duties of every day life,—have these men, we ask, no means of attaining a firm and reasonable faith? The Church, surely, is a city set upon a hill; with the notes of her divine commission so distinctly impressed on her whole aspect, that rich and poor, learned and simple, alike may read them, so only they have some real sense of their own ignorance and sinfulness, and some real desire of supernatural truth and holiness. Of these notes, indeed, some will be more directly significant to one class of persons, and some to another; but, taken collectively, they are addressed to collective man: all would discern them whose moral dispositions are as just now supposed, as they come from under the shadow of their early discipline and associations, except for those prejudices which possess to the full as frequently the learned and intellectual as the rude and ignorant; yes, and which exist in forms, different indeed but to the full

* His *professed* rule of faith, we mean; we are of course not conceding that his theology is accordant with the facts of church history, for we have just stated how conspicuously it runs counter to them.

as dense and darkening, in the one class as in the other. And while such is the case even as regards strangers to her communion, for those who have the blessedness to be admitted within her pale, to borrow Mr. Thompson's beautiful expression (p. 9), "sight seems to supersede the necessity of proof, and the harmonious proportions and solid structure of the city of the living God ask not for line and measure, but the admiring eye and adoring heart."

This is not the place to prove this statement, or even so to explain and guard it as to prevent possible misconstruction: to do so would require a separate essay of itself, and one of no inconsiderable length. It is quite sufficient, indeed, for the purpose of our argument, merely to state that Catholics *do* hold a rule of faith distinct from the historical. For the state of the argument is as follows:—God, having made a revelation to mankind, requires those to whose knowledge it comes to hold faithfully and firmly the doctrines contained in it. Now, if He had appointed the study of church history as the means of learning these doctrines, there would necessarily be the greatest harshness and improbability in the supposition, that they were not at once, and without possibility of question, there discoverable. But if He have appointed quite a different means for learning them, as all Catholics are bound to hold, viz. a submission to the existing Church's authority, then it is in no way opposed to our impression of His attributes, nor inconsistent with the sweet providence wherewith He governs His Church, that He should not have specially interposed in this particular case, to make ecclesiastical history unlike all other history; that in the study of patristic, as of secular, documents, there should still be found, at first starting, that disorder, and confusion, and difficulty of reduction to any fixed principle, which, in the natural course of things, is inevitably attendant upon a mass of historical facts.

Let it not be said that any disparagement here is implied either of the value of ecclesiastical history or of the certainty of its results. Certainly, in a parallel case, such an imputation would present a very strange appearance. If one were to urge, e. g., that, in order to appreciate rightly the prominent and salient facts of Athenian history, and to detect the principles really at work under them, some far greater exertion of mind is necessary than a mere

orderly collation of these facts—that the historian must search diligently and indefatigably for every ascertainable trace of the daily habits and the general tone of feeling on matters religious, personal, and social, prevalent among them—that he must study attentively and profoundly the contemporary poetry and the conflicting systems of philosophy—that he must carry his investigations deeply into human nature itself, and base his superstructure on no shallower or less secure foundation; if one were to urge all this, certainly an objector's mind must be very unusually constituted, which should charge one with a wish to speak disparagingly of the science of history. The very contrary is the case: if history be more than "an old almanack," it must be precisely because the placing of ancient facts before our mind as living and breathing realities, which is the province of history, is an incomparably higher and nobler effort of the mind than their mere recital as naked and characterless events.

And as we are not undervaluing, in what we have said, the inherent *dignity* of the science, neither are we undervaluing the *certainly* of its *results*. The very contrary, again: it is by help of such principles as we have been laying down, that history is fast rising into the rank of a positive science; that now, for the first time, it is tending to gather together conclusions which are accepted by all thinkers as undeniable; and which may serve as fixed premisses from which future investigation shall start. Little as has yet been done of this kind, in comparison with what we may expect; still, what has been done is not in itself insignificant. Just as in the region of external facts, we owe it to the unwearied labours and minute accuracy of Dr. Lingard, that the very children of the present day are taught to put no confidence in Hume's romantic fiction, called by him a history; so also, in the region of deductions and generalizations, so much at least has been effected, on the one hand by such writers as Thierry and Guizot, on the other by such as De Maistre, that not Voltaire's absurd puerilities only, but the views set forth by authors of Hallam's stamp on the history of Christian times in general and of the mediæval period in particular, are finally and for ever exploded in the minds of thinking men. And the progress of thought is most rapid on the subject. It is not so very long since the history of eighteen hundred years was treated as hardly

more than an armoury, from which conflicting parties seized as it were at random the first weapon that came to hand, so it had any promise of effectiveness, and hurled it in each other's teeth. Then was the time to descant on the hopelessness of obtaining results from history; but that was for the very reason that history was consulted with the expectation of *finding* its real lessons *on the surface*. But now that deeper and truer views of the science are prevailing, we believe the time is not very far distant—there are signs of it already neither few nor faint—when it will be a matter of agreement among all really well-informed and philosophical thinkers that, whether Christianity be true or false, at all events Catholicism and Christianity are historically *identical*.

It is not, then, from any misgiving as to the historical strength of Catholicism, but for the sake of truth itself, that we protest so vehemently against the notion, that to test the Apostolicity of doctrines by means of patristic studies, is an easy and simple process, open to enquirers of ordinary attainments and of ordinary leisure. It is natural enough for readers of mere compendia to think so; passages of the holy Fathers are put before them as containing some particular doctrine, while the innumerable qualifying or perplexing circumstances are passed over in silence. But never did we meet with a student who had himself launched upon the sea of Antiquity, who had himself gone through a wide and deep course of patristic reading, who was not forward in the avowal, that the task of combining, systematising, and representing the varied information conveyed by such studies, is one which requires the employment of much patient thought and much careful analysis; and that, moreover, on many subjects, nothing short of the most extensive acquaintance with the whole theological literature of a period will afford sufficient materials for the task. At the same time, one can well understand what pleasure the historian reaps at every stage of his onward progress: when the key is found which will serve as the solution of a hitherto confused and entangled knot—when the point of view is discovered from which a mass of facts, hitherto disorganized and mutually obstructive, assumes at last the shape of a complete and harmonious whole—we can well understand with what especial richness and significance of colouring each feature of the scene becomes adorned. And in this connection it is

interesting to mention, that more than one of the recent converts, who had been especially given to the study of the holy Fathers, and had been drawn towards the Church mainly by that study, have declared that, since their accession to the light of Catholic Faith and the grace of Catholic Communion, their former reading has been invested with so much of new significance and of deeper meaning, that it appears as though they had never before really understood it.

Of course there *are* truths readily and certainly discoverable on the very surface of Christian history; especially there are many *negative* truths so discoverable. That Christianity is not Protestantism, for example, is one of those truths; and another is, we will add, that Mr. Allies's own theory is contrary both to the external facts and the inward spirit of the whole current of church history. We may say also, in reference to this very question of the papal supremacy, that we have stated the general difficulties of history, more for the sake of asserting the principle, than for any especial obscurity which hangs over the facts connected with this doctrine. For, though they do not quite carry their own interpretation on their face, and some little careful attention is necessary to detect the principle at work under them, it requires no very great research or reflection to do so; though we must search a little deeper than Mr. Allies's plummet has reached, it is no very profound abyss we have to fathom. Not only has Mr. Thompson executed his task on the whole with triumphant success in a work of little more than 200 pages, but he has really met with no serious impediment to be overcome. He has had possession, as he very tranquilly tells us (p. x.), "of an *idea* which so perfectly harmonizes with the language of the Fathers, and so completely coincides with the facts to which Mr. Allies has appealed, that the result of a perusal of his [Mr. Allies's] work has been only a *deeper apprehension of the divine rights and powers of the papal see.*" We may add, that we know of another person, wholly unversed in the writings of the holy Fathers, on whom the work had a precisely similar effect.

Here, as we are speaking of truths which are on the surface of church history, it is important to notice one, which is so apparent as absolutely to force itself on one's notice, and to require for its appreciation no other qualification than the most general and cursory acquaintance with

that history: while at the same time it precisely performs the service we have been desiderating; viz. that of serving as a clue to the comprehension of those facts, which it is difficult otherwise to harmonize and interpret: a truth this also, which has always, and most justly, ranked among Catholics as one of the most convincing and undeniable notes of the Church. But, in order to make clearer its force and bearing, let us first take a brief retrospective glance.

If we look back, then, to the picture of the Apostolic Church contained in the Acts and Epistles, we shall observe a most remarkable correspondence with our blessed Lord's declaration about His "kingdom" and its "keys," as well as with the anticipation of Gospel times held forth in the Old Testament. The first Christians, as we shall find, were formed into one visible and organized society, under the governance of those who were divinely inspired to teach them. Whether the special office of St. Peter be or be not plainly apparent on the surface of Scripture, this, at least, is most plainly apparent, — that the Christian Church was one organized body politic, just as truly as England or France is a body politic; and differing in its constitution from this world's kingdoms only in this one respect, that its sanctions and punishments are not material but spiritual. The spread of Christ's Gospel was the propagation of the Apostolic Empire; the two proceeded *pari passu* together, or, rather, were one and the same thing, separable only by the intellect. As a flock look to a shepherd for guidance, or children to their parent, and never in their very dreams (if we may so speak) separate the idea of humbly learning from that of willingly obeying, so was it with the first Christians. With them, to be within the Church was salvation, to be without it was eternal ruin; and to be within the Church, implied in its very nature to be obedient to her laws and governance, and to be gradual recipients of her doctrine. With them to be taught and to be governed were not two different things, but only two different aspects of one and the same thing. Nor was this kingdom to end with the life of the Apostles. Our blessed Lord's own words plainly point to it as the essential form which Christianity is to wear while the world lasts; and, as a matter of fact, the bishops contemporary with St. John, who must necessarily have known God's will on the subject, continued onwards this kingdom

after his death, on the very same principles on which it had proceeded under Apostolic guidance.

So far as this we have, of course, Mr. Allies cordially with us; and we have his express testimony (p. 15.) to a fact, which, indeed, no reader of history can doubt, that, although, "so long as the Church was engaged in a fierce and unrelenting conflict with the paganism and despotism of the empire, she could hardly exhibit to the world her complete outward organization;" still, "united she had ever been, from the day of Pentecost, in charity, in doctrine, in sacraments, in *communion*." "No other idea about the Church prevailed up to St. Gregory's time," than that of "one organic whole: a body with one Head,* and many members; a kingdom with one sovereign and rulers, an Apostolic College appointed by that Head." (p. 198.) We may add, too, though, as Mr. Thompson truly remarks, (p. 144, note,) Mr. Allies seems very shy of speaking out on this particular question, that the Church of that day claimed to herself the attribute of infallibility in the most signal and emphatic manner in which it was possible to claim it. For, on the one hand, she most distinctly and consistently proclaimed the doctrine, that communion with her was essential to salvation; and, on the other hand, she was constantly in the practice of expelling persons from that communion on the ground of heresy. To suppose that a Church, endued by Christ Himself with spiritual power, could so act, unless her supreme authority (wherever that might be lodged) had the gift of infallibly pronouncing on matters of doctrine, would be to suppose it possible that our blessed Lord should exclude a man from salvation for the offence of—holding a doctrine which He had Himself taught. However, it is needless to say more in illustration of a fact which no one will question: the claim, namely, to infallibility made by the Church during the period on which Mr. Allies speaks. It appears, then, that this single-minded and filial feeling of which I have already spoken, as characterising the first Christians in

* Mr. Allies means to speak of our *Blessed Lord* as the One Head and One Sovereign; and he adds at the end of the quotation we have made, the words, "with a direct commission from himself." The words refer to a notion of Mr. Allies, which will presently come into controversy, but do not bear on the direct subject with which we are engaged in the text.

their demeanour of mind towards the Apostles, has its exact counterpart in the immediately succeeding times of the Church; that then also, as at first, the office of authoritatively teaching and of authoritatively governing were regarded as merely two aspects of one identical office.

Now, the truth to which we just now referred, is this:—that, as from the Apostolic period to the Nicene, so also from the latter period to the present day, there has always been one, and there has never been more than one, organized body, claiming to be the direct and lineal heir of the Apostolic Church—requiring all men to whom knowledge of her position shall come, to unite themselves to her communion and submit themselves to her laws, on pain of eternal condemnation—asserting to herself the distinct privilege of infallibility, and, in virtue of that privilege, anathematizing freely from time to time such new opinions as she judges to be either directly, or by implication, at variance with the doctrine committed to her charge—in a word, claiming at the hands of her children, and, we may add, receiving in no stinted or unwilling measure, that very childlike, simple, and loyal confidence in her authority, as in that of Christ's one earthly representative, of which we have already more than once spoken. It is plain, we say, that there is one only such body. The very word “infallibility,” by an inevitable association of ideas, leads the mind on to the word “Rome.” When persons complain of some one church as domineering, as encroaching on the territory of others, as enforcing articles of faith on her own authority, is it of Mr. Allies's friends, the schismatical *Greeks*, that the discourse is running? Almost as we write a certain Mr. Finch, in the House of Commons,* declares that, for his part, he would grant toleration to every sect *except the Roman Church*; because she, and *she alone*, claims to be mother and mistress of churches. If there be a successor to the Apostolic Church, the Church which alone, both in words and deeds, *claims* to be such, is that successor; if there be not such a successor, prophets have prophesied falsely, and the Christian Church, just coming from the very living presence of the Apostles, has misinterpreted her Lord's declarations and commands on the very primary law of His kingdom.

* See the Debate on the second reading of the Catholic Relief Bill.

The objection to this statement, founded on the various anti-popes who have risen up from time to time, is almost too frivolous to deserve an answer. In such cases there has been no dispute on any point of doctrine; no dispute on the principle that the Church is essentially one organic whole; no dispute on the principle that St. Peter was the divinely appointed centre of unity; no dispute on the principle that the Bishop of Rome succeeds St. Peter in that office. The dispute turned wholly on a question of fact, whether this or that individual were the canonically elected Bishop of the Holy See. And in all the cases without exception, before any great lapse of time, our Lord showed plainly to the Church which one was His real Vicar, by bringing the rival successions, if such there were, to a close.

We may set forth the same substantial statement as to the position of the Church, which we have just made, in Mr. Lewis's deep and pregnant words (p. 6); though he seems rather engaged in setting forth another and not less important phase of the same truth. He seems, namely, to look at it, not so much in its historical connection as in its moral bearing; and to be setting forth the claims of the Church, not so prominently in its aspect of successor to the Apostolic, as in its aspect of the one authoritative guide, by its whole constitution and demeanour plainly marked out as such, to those who are in search of such a guide under a deep feeling of its indispensable necessity.

"One solitary corporation," he says, "there seems to be, aggressive and exclusive, favourably regarded by none who are not partakers of its immunities. It professes to be the only one that is in possession of the true religion, and warns all who resist it, that they are fighting against God. It announces itself as infallible, so cutting off from the others the bare possibility of their being right; it puts forth its principles in plain intelligible words, shrinking from no conclusion to which they lead; it explains away nothing that may have given offence to those who are without; what these call impious, wicked, or profane, it teaches, practises, and enforces, just as if no question had been made of the matter. Moreover, conscious of unearthly strength, it ascertains its own position, defining the several duties of its several members; it allows of no vague and uncertain obedience, but insists upon it in a specific clear way, putting forth its regulations with that particular minuteness of detail, which leaves no room for ignorance or mistake. Is it in error? Its adversaries say so with one voice; but for itself it has no misgivings, it claims the possession of supernatural powers, and we

see it use them ; it has one definite local habitation, so that all may find it ; it has one fountain of visible authority, but it flows through the whole world ; one supreme incontrollable dominion to which all must have recourse, from which issues forth the voice of St. Peter himself, giving law to the Catholic Church."

Another salient feature of similarity between the Catholic Church of the Nicene period and of the present day, has been drawn out by the "Recent Convert." The Nicene Creed gives formally a description of the Church, "One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic." To what body does this description apply at the present day?

"The Established Church of England *manifestly* fails in two, at least, of these notes, viz. Catholicity and Unity. Catholic she not only is not, but from her very constitution cannot be ; for she is the Church of the English empire alone. She has no existence and no mission out of the Queen's dominions ; she spreads or she shrinks, as these are enlarged or contracted. The single apparent exception to this rule is the Jerusalem Bishopric, which churchmen disown. Moreover, even at Jerusalem the Established Church possesses no local See, but a mere superintendence of British residents ; the title of the Bishop is not Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem, but Bishop of the United Church, &c. in Jerusalem. The Church of England, therefore, in herself, is not, and cannot be, the 'Holy Church throughout the world,' of which the Te Deum speaks, nor the 'One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church' of the Nicene Creed.

"In herself she cannot be such : is she, however, such, (as some say,) inasmuch as she is an integral part of the Catholic Church ? Not so ; for, to be such, she should be owned by what are called the remaining parts. Her bare assertion, that she is such, does not make her such ; again, as a *Church*, she does not assert this, but only in the person of a comparatively small number of her members. Other views of her character and mission are quite as rife within her as this 'branch' theory ; nay, far more so ; and those views, rather than this theory, have the sanction of her actual authorities. But even were it otherwise ; even did the Established Church love the Roman and Greek churches, as much as she certainly hates the former, and shuns the latter, this would not prove her to be one with them, in the teeth of their entire disavowal of all connexion with her. It is at least as likely they should be right in their view as she in hers, considering how far they outnumber her ; and especially since, although at variance with one another, they agree in disowning her. Now what is the fact ? That, whether members of the Anglican Church go to the Roman or to the Greek Church, they are alike refused communion, on the ground of their

being an integral part, not of the Catholic, but of the Protestant body.

"And hence the Established Church of England lacks also that primary note of the Church—Unity. 'Hereby shall men know that ye are My disciples,' says our Lord, 'if ye have love one to another.' Our Lord here plainly refers to some *visible* token, not to any mere inward bond or tacit agreement. 'Hereby shall men *know*,' &c.; therefore Unity is styled a 'note' of the Church. This indeed follows from the Church being (as all churchmen consider it) a *visible* body. Her unity, the mutual affection between her members, must be *apparent*, or it is not the unity our Lord requires. And how can it be pretended that there is even so much as an *internal* unity, *i. e.* a unity of feeling, between the churches of Rome and Greece and that established in England? Are the members of the Church of England, as a body, more kindly affected towards the members of the Greek or of the Roman Communion, as a body, than towards Dissenters and other Protestants? Nay, is it not the fact, that they are notoriously less so? Is it too much to say, that any manifestation of sympathy with the Church of Rome, at least, so far from being natural to the Church of England, is rather the one especial signal for mistrust on the part of her members, and of discountenance on that of her authorities? There is no subject on which the Established Church is perfectly at one; but that which, perhaps, unites the largest amount of suffrages in its favour is—dislike of the Church of Rome. And this is certainly true of the Established Church during the whole period of her history since the Reformation, as any one may know by consulting the language of her best divines.

"If the Church of England be thus clearly wanting in the notes of Catholicity and Unity, (the very first principles of her constitution, as an independent national body, being essentially Anticatholic,) there is no need to go into the questions of her correspondence with the other marks, of Sanctity and Apostolicity, though much might be said on these subjects also; because, since the Church is to be denoted by *several* signs together, the clear absence, in the case of any particular Communion, of *one* essential mark, is decisive against the claim of such communion to be accounted the Church of Christ, or part of it.

"Is there a Communion in which all the acknowledged notes of the Church combine? There is one, and but one. The Church of Rome is certainly Apostolical; certainly she has the note of Sanctity (witness the unbroken chain of her canonized Saints;) she is certainly Catholic in constitution, in profession, and in fact; and certainly One in the essentials of Doctrine and of the Sacraments, as well as in the mutual and active inter-communion of her members, and of the different local Churches in her obedience.

"To compare her, for an instant, with the Church of England in respect of Catholicity and Unity: is not a Roman Catholic at home

in every country, and in every quarter of the globe? Is not the spiritual empire of the Holy See quite independent of geographical boundaries and national distinctions? If England should lose her colonial possessions to-morrow, where would be the Church of England but shut up in England? But the empire and province of the Catholic Church would remain, as they are, universal, though the boundaries of earthly kingdoms should be entirely changed.

"Now, consider our Blessed Lord's command to His Apostles, and through them to His Church of every time: 'Go and teach *all nations*.' Of institutions now claiming the name of Churches, which alone can obey this command?"—pp. 3-6.

It is a significant fact, that the first named of these two arguments we have drawn out in defence of the claims of the Catholic Church—an argument which, in one shape or other, is of all the most common in Catholic controversial works—seems never to have been present to Mr. Allies's mind. Let us now, then, advert to *his* statement on the elementary principle which is to be our key in interpreting church history. Here it is:

"The bishops throughout the world.....are successors of the apostles, invested with the plenitude of that royal priesthood, which the Son of God had set upon the earth in His own person, and from that person had communicated to His chosen disciples, and so possessed of whatever authority was necessary to govern the Church.....And viewed in itself, this power *was sovereign and independent in every individual bishop*, who was the spouse of the Church, the successor of the apostles, and of Peter, *the centre of unity*; able moreover to communicate this authority to others, and to become the source of a long line of spiritual descendants....The see of Peter, so often referred to by St. Cyprian...means the see of every bishop who holds that office, whereof Peter is the great type, example, and source."—pp. 16, 17, 31.

Now, in dealing with so confused and misty a writer as Mr. Allies, it is extremely difficult to save one's self from the charge of unfairness, and of pressing individual statements without due consideration of the writer's general meaning. We can only say, that we have done the utmost in our power to avoid such a course; but we have a very difficult part to play in the matter. Thus, as to the expressions above quoted, however clear and distinct in themselves, it might still very easily be said, that there are many other passages in the work which, not only in their spirit, but even in the way of direct logical conse-

quence, are directly contradictory to these expressions. We cannot deny all this: Mr. Allies is an inconsecutive, contradictory thinker. Still, the doctrine expressed above is contained in a more precise and definite shape than is any contradictory doctrine; and, consequently, it seems more natural to make it the foundation of our remarks. In fact, if we were to go by the general spirit and drift of the work, we should be led to think that the author regarded the *patriarchal system* as of divine right: but we cannot impute to him this opinion, because (1.) such an opinion would be fatal to his own cause, seeing there is no patriarch from whom the Anglican bishops derive jurisdiction; and (2.) because he has distinctly contemplated the question, and rules (p. 54.) that, though that system "approaches very nearly to" being of divine right, "and was the effluence of the Spirit of God, ruling and guiding the Church of the Fathers," still it was "not *strictly* of divine right, *as is the high priesthood of the bishops.*"

And we feel ourselves the more at liberty to take this as the fundamental doctrine for which Mr. Allies is to be responsible, because it is the recognized doctrine of Anglicans of his own school. Thus Mr. Thompson (p. 187) quotes an Anglican reviewer of Mr. Allies's work, as distinctly laying down the principle: "Every small, poor, humble diocese is competent, if all the rest were swallowed up by physical or moral ruin, to refill the world. *Each bishop is bishop of the entire Church*; holds the full apostolic powers," &c. The same doctrine was the one key-note of all the earlier "Tracts for the Times," and was never in the Tracts qualified or retracted. "Our holy fathers, the bishops," are "representatives of the apostles and the angels of the churches," because "if we trace back the power of ordination from hand to hand, we shall come to the Apostles at last." (Tract i.) "We are members of the Church Apostolical," because "we have apostolical succession, (Tract iv.); and so on to the end of the chapter. On this doctrine, too, is grounded the whole notion of the Oxford writers about Catholics being schismatics in England; and, again, the strange sort of race that seems to be run for prior possession of some hitherto unappropriated locality; as when the Anglican Bishop of Tasmania gets a fortnight's start of his opponent, and then pronounces that the Catholic Bishop of Hobart Town is a schismatic. Exhibitions of this kind, which would be

unspeakably amusing if they were not so lamentable, and if one's heart did not bleed for those unhappy victims of the delusion, who, by such absurd child's play, are kept in ignorance of their true home—these exhibitions, we say, all proceed avowedly on the precise principle to which Mr. Allies above has given expression. Let us first, then, see what comes of this principle.

It is not a *consequence* of this principle, but a simple statement of it in other terms, that no bishop or episcopal body can possibly be schismatical. The "centre of unity," to use one of Mr. Allies's phrases, cannot possibly be *external* to unity; he with whom "sovereign and independent power" is lodged, to take another of his phrases, must possess that power "independently" of any condition as to communion with others; if to be governed by apostolically-descended bishops is a sufficient proof of being within the visible church, as the *Tracts for the Times* with one voice assert, it is simply an equipollent preposition to say, that no body governed by apostolically-descended bishops can be outside of the visible church. "The union," therefore, "of these several portions of the church," as Mr. Thompson observes, (p. 187,) "is not an *organic* but merely a *federal* union;" just such an union as there is between two independent nations, while a cordial understanding subsists. It is fully sufficient to state this proposition nakedly, and contrast it with the whole doctrine on church unity, expressed in all the language, and implied in all the proceedings, of the Fathers of the Nicene era. However, as it is worth while taking some little trouble to make clear the real nature of this preposterous theory, we will just draw out one or two consequences which, by logical necessity, are involved in it.

Thus, (1,) where such a view is held, there will be unceasing and unlimited tendency to break up the church into an indefinite number of episcopally-governed atoms. It may be quite true that, in a great number of cases, the act of a bishop in separating from the general mass will involve even grievous sin against charity and brotherly love: still there will be many cases also where it will not. Such is Mr. Allies's own judgment. There would be, he tells us, (p. 17,) "not only imminent danger, but almost *certainly*, that a power unlimited in its nature, committed to so large a number of men, *who might become indefinitely more numerous, yet were each independent centres*

of authority, instead of tending to unity would produce diversity." And it requires only a very little consideration of human nature and the circumstances of the world, to see on how large a scale such a result would follow. If two Saints, at a period too so close to the Apostolic, could differ on a matter in which no one now-a-days will deny that one view or the other was a heresy, (we allude of course to St. Stephen and St. Cyprian,) much more would ordinary bishops, who need not be Saints, so differ: and a difference on a subject of this nature, where there is no common authority to which obedience is due, must inevitably produce a separation: a bishop would fail in his duty, who should not guard his flock from contamination, by forbidding them intercourse with those who, in his serious judgment, were corrupting the pure faith of the Gospel. Nor is it only on questions of doctrine that such separations would be built; there are numberless matters of discipline, of ritual, of what we may call ecclesiastical prudence, which would produce a like result. Various bishops might all be in their way men even of holy and mortified life, and yet legitimately and naturally take such opposite views on a multitude of such questions, that intercommunion would be impossible: unless, of course, (which is the Catholic theory,) their own power is *not* by Divine right "sovereign and independent," but there is some other tribunal to which they are bound by God's law to submit. And we have only further to carry our mind gradually onwards from the fourth century, and recall to our memory the innumerable new questions on faith and practice which the church has had to encounter in her course, to form some idea of the Babel-like confusion, the indescribable hubbub, in which the whole church would be involved, by the time she came down to the nineteenth century.

But Mr. Allies tells us that a remedy was provided against this by the patriarchal system. Certainly if that system were of *divine right*, a remedy would be so far provided; instead of "*tot ecclesiæ quot episcopi*," it would only be "*tot ecclesiæ quot patriarchæ*;" which, as the patriarchs were only four, and the bishops more nearly four thousand,* would be a very considerable mitigation. But then Mr. Allies, as already quoted, tells us distinctly that this con-

* More than *one* thousand unquestionably.

stitution was *not* of directly divine authority; and if this be so, we see not how it would provide any remedy at all. A bishop would fail very disgracefully in his bounden duty, if when seriously believing christian faith or morals to be tampered with, he were restrained by a rule of the *church* from snatching out of contamination those committed to him by the law of *God*. Nor would even any *engagements* of obedience to his metropolitan or patriarch, affect the question. If I made the most solemn promise in the world to allow my young children to mix familiarly with those of some one of my acquaintance, and afterwards discover that he encourages or allows his children in immorality or heresy, there is no casuist that ever lived who would hold me bound to my promise. Why? Because the duty of religiously educating my children is one of prior obligation. Not the *breaking* then, but the *taking*, vows of obedience to a metropolitan, would be the sin, according to the theory of "sovereign and independent" bishops.

To reasoning such as this, there is the strangest answer that was ever seen, in an article which appeared in the "Christian Remembrancer" of last January: the Reviewer says (p. 203), that in fact there has been no such interminable division, and to a moral certainty there never will be such; "because, therefore," he continues, "the fact of existing division has to be accounted for, we have not therefore to account for the fact of a vast amount of division which does not exist." As if, forsooth, all bishops throughout the world held this theory of their own "independent sovereignty," and were restrained from mutual separation, by the "love"* they bear to each other. Whereas we seriously believe that there is no one bishop or so-called bishop in the world, who really believes in any such theory. It is all very well to declaim on Mr. Allie's text of the "sovereign and independent power of bishops," as a weapon ready at hand to fling against Catholics; but does the Reviewer seriously mean that there are Anglican bishops who practically hold themselves to be at

* The Christian Remembrancer characterises the hypothetical case of such indefinite schism, as being "a state of things in which Christians, *instead of loving each other*, had grown to *hate* one another to such an extent, that no one single particle of the Church would cleave to any other."

liberty, if they will, to separate from the Established Church, and to have the power of carrying the members of their diocese along with them into their new community? The "Recent Convert," reminds us, (p. 16,) of the fact that one Anglican bishop protested against Dr. Gobat's appointment to the Jerusalem bishopric; and he too, if any one, professing "high-church" principles. Does the Reviewer wish us to understand that Dr. Philpotts believes he has the power, if he pleases, to mark his sense of this measure, by separating from the national communion and founding a "Church of Devonshire" as contrasted with the "Church of England?" Observe the inconsistency of Anglican controversialists. Here is an appointment objected to for no minor reasons, but on the distinct grounds of schism and heresy.* Catholics reproach the Anglican Church with the ignominy of the transaction. It is replied that two prelates alone are answerable for it, for that the Anglican Church itself has its hands tied.† And then the next minute we hear that so far from having its hands tied, each bishop has full liberty to act as he pleases; and that it is a proof of his "love" for his brethren on the episcopal bench, that he still unites himself to their communion.

(2.) Next it must be remembered, in judging of the theory under discussion, not only that bishops who really held it, would inevitably, and that without supposing any grievous sin, fall into constant divisions and sub-divisions; but even if they separated from each other in a spirit directly sinful, from a spirit of contention, or a desire of

* Mr. Allies himself is honourably explicit on this subject, (p. 203.) "If the Jerusalem bishopric," he says, "promoted (at the instance of a foreign minister not in communion with our Church, and who has recorded in the strongest terms his objection to her apostolical episcopacy,) by two bishops on their private responsibility....be the commencement of a course of amalgamation with the Lutheran or Calvinistic heresy, who that values the authority of the ancient undivided Church, does not feel his allegiance to our own branch fearfully shaken?"

† Thus Mr. Allies tells us, (p. 204.) that the "constitution" of the Anglican Church "*violently suspended by an enemy*, for one hundred and thirty years, yet requires that every one of her acts which bind her as a whole, should be assented to by her priesthood in representation, as well as by her episcopacy."

aggrandisement, their spiritual subjects would be compelled in bounden duty to follow them. This, we say, is necessarily involved in this theory; unless indeed Mr. Allies holds the Wickliffeite principle that, "dominion is founded in grace," and that mortal sin in a superior absolves the subject from his allegiance. This principle is of course simply anarchical, and was so used by those who invented it: it is so, as for other reasons, so also because no one except God and (if so be) his confessor can know the state of a bishop's conscience, and the whole principle of settled jurisdiction must therefore fall to the ground, if it be admitted. Here then is a new aspect of an old position; and "quicquid delirant reges plectuntur Achivi," becomes true in a deeper sense than the poet intended. No one, in fact, can open a single page of Ecclesiastical History, without seeing how numerous and how serious were the contentions of bishops. We have, e. g., St. Gregory Nazianzen's criticism on their behaviour at General Councils.

(3.) But the constitution of the Anglican Church requires a still further admission; it requires us to believe that each individual bishop may devise "articles of religion" of his own invention, and from his own private judgment on the Sacred Text; and require assent to such articles on the part of all whom he ordains. In other words, he may require his own private and peculiar notions to be held by every one of those from whom the people are to learn their religion.

(4.) Nay, what is to hinder him from imposing them actually on all as *terms of communion*? Or, rather, how can it be otherwise than his *duty* to impose new terms of communion, if some new and pernicious heresy be infecting his flock? But if God require this at his hands, He must have invested him with the correlative privilege of *infallibility*. "If every bishop," says Mr. Thompson, "possesses the episcopate in himself, he must also possess *infallibility* as well as sovereignty; if not, the episcopate is divided and its attributes separated from itself as well as from each other." (p. 144, note.)

And here too there will be present to the minds of all the continually reiterated assertion, that members of the Roman Communion, e. g., in England, are schismatics: an assertion indeed, which, to be consistent, ought to be carried further. Every one knows that the deliberate inten-

tion of committing mortal sin under given circumstances, is itself a state of mortal sin. But there is not a Catholic living, who does not deliberately intend, should he come to England, to go to mass and not to the Anglican service: therefore there is no Catholic living, who (except from invincible ignorance) is exempted from a state of mortal sin. We really owe our readers an apology for taking so much trouble with these puerilities; but it appears there *are* controversialists who are unable to enter into one's meaning, unless we draw it out even to tedious minuteness, and express it in terms "level to the meanest capacities."

Such then is the extraordinary position which a number of respectable gentlemen writing on theology have gravely maintained—in their closets and on paper. We will not, however, lay any further stress on the conclusions we have logically deduced from it; but we will take the theory in its undeveloped simplicity, and compare it with Mr. Allies's own test, the writings of the Early Fathers; nay, with the very quotations which Mr. Allies has himself brought together from those Fathers. Every bishop, says Mr. Allies, is himself "the centre of unity," and possessed of "sovereign and independent power." St. Hilary, bishop of Arles, in a provincial council, *deposes* Celidonius, bishop of Besançon: this also Mr. Allies tells us, (p. 103.). Again St. Cyprian writes to Pope St. Stephen, begging him to read a letter to the people of Arles, by which their bishop, *who had joined himself to the schismatic Novatian*, might be *excommunicated and another substituted for him*. What! "The centre of unity" excommunicated? One possessed of "sovereign and independent power" deposed? "The spouse of the church" divorced? "The successor of St. Peter" thrust from his chair? The Council of Antioch ordered that bishops, condemned by a provincial council, might recur to a larger council of bishops; the Council of Sardica, that they might appeal to the Pope: the "sovereign and independent" potentates are surely here exhibited in rather a dependent light. But it is really unnecessary to make further extracts; it is not too much to say that there is no one fact in the early ecclesiastical annals, be it as isolated, detached, and anomalous as you will, that can by any violence be so distorted, as to give even a momentary colour to this truly astonishing allegation. Whether we

look on the surface or under the surface, whether to the general spirit or to individual details, all facts of every kind conspire with one accord to negative and disprove it. We desire the candid reader merely to read through Mr. Allies's work, and question this statement of ours if he can.

And no one feels this fact more acutely than the author himself, though he has contrived to blind himself to his own feelings. No sooner has he stated his general theory, (p. 17,) than, under the influence of a secret consciousness how extravagantly that theory contradicts facts, he begins to qualify and half to retract. The episcopal power was by divine right "sovereign and independent;" *only* in practice "a preponderating influence was exercised by certain sees." In another place, where he expressly denies (p. 54,) that the patriarchal system was "strictly of divine right," he adds that, "it approaches very nearly to it, and was the effluence of the Spirit of God ruling and guiding the Church of the Fathers;" as though such an evasion would enable him to escape the legitimate consequences of his own formally expressed doctrine. A similar want of confidence in his own principles, is exhibited by his desire (p. 54,) to "justify himself from the damning blot of schism," by alleging against the existing Roman Church, innovation upon ancient principles: whereas, if his own views be just, he cannot possibly be *obnoxious* to the charge of schism, unless he doubts the validity of his diocesan's, Dr. Samuel Wilberforce's, consecration; a doubt which, however well-founded, has evidently never entered his mind. But there is no passage in the work which more signally exemplifies, on the one hand his rare candour and freedom from the ordinary controversial spirit, and on the other hand the dense confusion of ideas which possesses his mind, than the following very noteworthy passage. The "precedence or prerogative of Rome," he says, "to whatever extent it reached, was certainly...not either claimed or granted merely because Rome was the imperial city. It was explicitly claimed by the Bishop of Rome, and as *freely conceded by others to him*, as in a special sense successor to St. Peter.....From the very first the Roman Pontiff seems possessed himself, as from a living tradition which had thoroughly penetrated the local Roman Church, with a consciousness of some peculiar influence he was to exercise *over the whole*

Church. This consciousness does not show itself here and there in the line of Roman Pontiffs, but one and all seem to have imbibed it from the atmosphere which they breathed. That they were the successors of St. Peter, who himself *sat, and ruled, and spoke* in their person, was as strongly felt and as consistently declared by those Pontiffs who preceded the time of Constantine. as by those who followed. The feeling of their brother bishops concerning them may have been less definite, *as was natural*, but even those who most opposed any arbitrary stretch of authority on their part, as St. Cyprian, fully admitted that they sat in the See of St. Peter, and ordinarily treated them with the greatest deference. This is written *so very legibly upon the records of antiquity*, that I am persuaded any one, who is even very slightly acquainted with them, *cannot with sincerity dispute it.*"

Now it is precisely on this fundamental view of Mr. Allies, which we have been endeavouring to place distinctly before the mind of our readers, (in the hope that Mr. Allies may possibly be induced to place it distinctly before his own mind,) it is precisely upon this fundamental view that Mr. Thompson joins issue with him. "This is *not*," he says, (p. 2,) "the Catholic doctrine; it *was not* the doctrine of the Fathers and Councils of the first six centuries." "No individual bishop, as such, possesses a sovereign and independent power. *Sovereign and independent power is the prerogative of the whole episcopal body*; and the power which each bishop possesses, he possesses simply *as a member of that body*. But that body consists of bishops corporately united, not only one with another, but with one *as their head and connecting bond*. This head and bond is the Bishop of Rome, the Successor of St. Peter." (p. 30.) Such is the elementary principle or key, which Mr. Thompson brings forward as harmonizing and explaining both the acts and the words of the early centuries; and he proceeds to apply it to various quotations which Mr. Allies had produced. There is of course no room to follow him in this process: and we can only most strongly recommend our readers to procure the work itself; which they will find solid and convincing in the highest degree. At the same time nothing more is really necessary for an earnest enquirer, than to bear in mind the two antagonist principles, Mr. Allies's and Mr. Thomp-

son's, and apply them respectively, page after page, to an appreciation of the phenomena on which Mr. Allies rests. He will at once find, that while Mr. Allies's view only makes "confusion worse confounded," and would reduce the history of those times to one mass of inexplicable contradictions and incongruities, by help of the Catholic principle as stated by Mr. Thompson, the facts form themselves into an intelligible and harmonious group.

Mr. Thompson directs attention to the distinction, so continually forgotten by Anglicans, between *jurisdiction* and *order*; and explains that the present controversy turns wholly on the former. Were the validity of the Anglican orders as certain and unquestionable as it is in truth most doubtful and problematical, the cause of Anglicans would not be advanced one step. No Catholics doubt that the separated Greeks, or the Nestorians, or the Jacobites, have true and valid ordinations; yet, at the same time, no Catholic doubts that men dying in those communions, unless they have the plea of invincible ignorance, forfeit salvation. The question of *jurisdiction* is the one really at issue: and on that question Mr. Thompson does not for a moment hesitate to adopt Bellarmine's statement, (the very statement against which Mr. Allies so earnestly protests,) as being logically "involved in the primary idea of the Episcopate," and expressing moreover pretty evidently the *mind* of the Church at the present day; although it is not as yet formally defined and sanctioned. That statement, as is well known, declares that the jurisdiction of all other bishops is, not directly from God, but derived from the Pope. This "may be regarded," he says, (p. 5,) "by some as an extreme conclusion; but I am thoroughly satisfied that men's hearts in these days are not gained by half-statements, nor their convictions secured by withholding the full logical consequences which appear to be logically deducible from any ruled doctrine of the Church."

The other side of Bellarmine's statement is perhaps less generally known. While contending zealously for what is really essential, with characteristic moderation he opposes the extreme opinions of those, who maintained that *the Apostles* derived their jurisdiction from St. Peter. His doctrine is well illustrated and explained by Mr. Thompson. (p. 65.)

"While on earth, our Lord was not only, as He ever is, the head

of His mystical body, and the true source of all power in it, but He was also the *Visible Head* and *Visible Source* of jurisdiction. Ere He ascended up into heaven, He commissioned Peter and made him the supreme pastor and visible head of His Church.....then also He commissioned the rest of His apostles in conjunction with Peter. He conferred upon them *an universal mission*. He conferred it upon them *corporately in union with Peter*. He did not give the whole world to each singly.....neither did He divide the world into twelve equal portions, and give to each a twelfth; but He gave it first to Peter, and then He gave it to the rest in union with Peter....Hence Peter may be said to be the *source* of their jurisdiction, not as if it were conferred by him, but because, though conferred immediately by Christ, it was conferred upon them only as united with Peter.....

"The jurisdiction which the first *bishops* received, was not conferred upon them immediately by Christ, but by the Apostles. This power of conferring jurisdiction the Apostles had in virtue of their universal mission: but the mission which the bishops received was *not universal*, but *particular only*. When the Apostles founded churches, they did not communicate to those they placed over them that universal mission which they had themselves received, but conferred upon them a restricted and limited power. And moreover, in conferring it, they did it not of their single independent authority, but in virtue of their corporate union, with one at their head, viz., Peter.

"Now a little reflection would convince us that nothing less than *Apostolic* power could bestow jurisdiction; and that the question therefore is, *where* that *Apostolic* power has continued to reside, and consequently it might be sufficient to observe that as *there were not many episcopates, but one episcopate, so there were not many sources of jurisdiction, but one source*; in other words, that the twelve Apostles were not twelve original sources of jurisdiction, but that, as the episcopate had its origin in one, viz., Peter, so the source of jurisdiction was in the same; and that, in fact, *he alone of all the Apostles left an actual successor*, who therefore succeeded not only to his *Apostolic* power, but to his headship or supremacy over the Church.....If it was James the Apostle who was bishop of Jerusalem, his successor in the see possessed not his *Apostolic* but his episcopal or diocesan power.....Whatever, therefore, may have been the discipline of the Church at different times, the real ultimate source of jurisdiction has ever been the same. By whomsoever conferred, jurisdiction has always been derived from the source which Christ established at the beginning, viz., Peter and his successors. Each of the Apostles, in virtue of their universal mission, had, in union with Peter, the power of bestowing jurisdiction. But since they departed from the Church, the Pope alone possesses that power singly, which the episcopal body possesses in corporate union with him; for it is thus only that the bishops are the

successors of the Apostles. The Pope is therefore, *jure divino*, the *ultimate* source of all ordinary jurisdiction, whether it be actually conferred by him or no. In the present discipline of the Church it is actually conferred by him."

It is of course impossible, by any abridgment or extracts, to give any fair or adequate idea of Mr. Thompson's argument; which is the most masterly and the most completely worked out, that we have met with for a long time. If it be said that the theory stated above, however consistent and comprehensive, is *only* a theory; the answer of course is ready: the historical proof of it is to be sought in the writings of the Holy Fathers. Mr. Thompson maintains that this theory does on the whole explain and harmonize their separate statements, views, and acts, and that no other theory has any pretensions to do so: and in particular he applies himself to the various quotations or facts brought forward by Mr. Allies, and shows that not that gentleman's view but the Catholic doctrine, is the true and legitimate exponent of those facts. Mr. Allies indeed himself does not attempt to deny, what his quotations expressly declare, that the Pope was explicitly and distinctly regarded from the first, as the divinely constituted centre of unity in the Church; fatal though such an admission be to his own cause. And on the other hand, Mr. Thompson is far from alleging that the full extent of the consequences, or the full depth of the significance, involved in this high office, was realised in earlier as in later times.

"It is not necessary to suppose, as it is not here maintained, that the exact relations between St. Peter's successor and his episcopal brethren, were finally determined and specifically defined in the earlier ages. These would be gradually developed and more accurately stated, as the circumstances of the Church brought them under consideration. I do not mean that the supremacy would be developed, for that existed by Christ's institution from the beginning; but that the Church, as a living body, would exert whatever powers she possessed inherently in herself, as occasion required; and in the course of such exertion, would demonstrate *where* they resided, and cause them to be more clearly ascertained and defined. Thus *the Church seems to have been possessed from the first, with the simple primary idea, that the Apostolic body in indissoluble union with Peter as its head, composed the one episcopate, and was the source of all authority and jurisdiction.* The early Fathers might not have as clear and definite idea as now possesses the Catholic mind, that the fulness of those powers resided in the Pope, as acting by

himself; but though not as clear and definite, the *true* idea they certainly possessed—and I am far from allowing that every truth has not been from the first in the mind of the Church—as shown indisputably when emergencies arose, and called for final adjustment and decision. Whenever such emergencies arose, the mind of the Church immediately *felt* where her appeal and help lay. She turned to the see of Peter. This Mr. Allies allows, though he does not appear to perceive the cause of it. The cause was this, that the Church implicitly held, what she holds now, that the see of Peter is the source, and the seat, of her supreme authority. She was habitually acting upon that knowledge in the manner and degree which circumstances called for; and as the truths at the foundation of this her constant practice were impugned or denied, she, who like the wise householder can produce from her treasures things new and old, brought forward into prominent teaching, that which from the first she had implicitly held and acted on. How otherwise is to be accounted for the constant turning of the Church in her distresses and difficulties, whether from heresy or injustice, to the see of Peter? Why should such turning be natural to her, but for a divine instinct deeply seated in the heart of the Church, upon which she had not as yet consciously reasoned, which told her where lay the rock and foundation of that strength? To deny her knowledge on that account, would be unphilosophical and untrue; *conscious reasoning is but one form and shape in which knowledge expresses itself, and naturally not the first.* Neither let it be said that the Church herself was in her infancy and had a limited understanding; the truth rather being that her *state* at first was an infant state, and that she put forth only such powers as that state required. Surely it is not to degrade the Church to argue thus, *since He, whose body she is, and whose life she represents, condescended Himself, who was Infinite Wisdom, to become an 'infant of days,' and to display His divine knowledge by a sort of economy, increasing in wisdom as in stature.*

“I do not mean that there was nothing more than an instinct and a feeling, for the mind of the Church at times expressed itself in the very strongest terms. Still there was more in these terms of the expression of a feeling, or the incidental allusion to a well recognised principle, undisputed and unquestioned, and therefore the less defined and analyzed, than of precise dogmatic statement. We are perhaps less capable of speaking clearly upon the primary principles upon which we act, which being, as it were, the starting points of our action, are therefore neither questioned nor reflected upon, than any others. The more the whole moral being of a person is at unity with itself, the less he seems capable of dissecting and examining the springs of action, and the principles by which his life is governed. The deepest feelings express themselves the most spontaneously, and therefore unconsciously, and the process by its rapidity evades the eye; and thus it was with the Church in her youth, as we may conceive it was with man in his primæval

state ; her actions embodied deep thoughts and prophecies ; her feelings were divine instincts."—pp. 95-99.

Having begun to cite this exceedingly beautiful and forcible passage, we could not forbear from bringing it to a conclusion ; though the earlier part of it alone would have sufficed to show the course of Mr. Thompson's reasoning. And now, from the Pope's prerogative of *supreme governance*, let us turn our mind to another of his chief prerogatives, that of *infallibility*.

"It is a matter of notoriety, that wherever a council has opposed the Pope in matters of faith, the council has yielded at length, and been proved to be wrong ; but that whenever a Pope has refused to ratify the decrees of a council, his judgment has been accepted in the end and proved to be right. This exemption from error Mr. Allies remarks upon, attributing the great 'moral weight' which 'the voice of the bishop of Rome' obtained in the Church to a 'concurrence of events,' in all which he 'was beheld immoveable, supporting with his whole authority what *turned out* to be the orthodox view.' Rather, I would say, it was thus that the feeling which had possessed the Church from the beginning, gradually assumed the form of a conscious and settled conviction. And what, I would ask, can have so firmly fixed in the mind of the Church, a belief in the infallibility of her head, as this constant experience of the unerring orthodoxy of his authoritative judgments ? As then it was part of God's providential dealings with His Church, that the unity of her faith should be more clearly demonstrated by the consent of her bishops, so He would show to the world, rather by experience than by express declaration, that the infallibility which resided in the whole collective episcopate, resided also in him, who, as Peter's successor, was 'the head and pillar of the faith, and foundation of the Catholic Church ;' and that it was the same Spirit of Truth Who spoke, whether the whole body concurred in an audible judgment, or the head alone gave utterance to His word."—pp. 158-160.

By the phrase "rather by experience than by express declaration," we do not understand the author to deny, indeed his whole argument shows that he is as far as possible from denying, that the Pope's infallibility in his dogmatical decisions, was *really involved* in the express declarations made by our Blessed Lord and His Apostles ; but only that the course of circumstances was the especial means whereby the "mind of the Church," if we may use such a phrase, came to see that it *was* so involved ; and whereby individual christians felt more deeply and habitu-

ally the *doctrinal truth* of the original instinct. For observe,—if (as is most certain from the very surface of Church History) the Church was looked upon from the very first by the faithful, as being both the one only ark of salvation, and also the one only visible light to guide them in their pilgrimage to Eternity; if (to use an illustration we have already adopted) their feeling towards their spiritual rulers in their respective spheres was that of sheep towards a shepherd, of children toward a parent, inasmuch that the respective ideas of obeying their commands and submitting to their instruction, were united into one inseparable impression in the mind of any humble-minded Christian; it follows, both that the general doctrine of the Church's infallibility was held, at least implicitly, from the very first, and also that in proportion as the idea of "centre of unity" was seen to involve that of "supreme governor," in that proportion and with precisely a corresponding march, would it be seen to involve that of "infallible interpreter of Apostolic doctrine."

Let us look at this more closely. Mr. Allies, with characteristic candour, mentions the following as a fact, "written so very legibly upon the records of Antiquity," that he is "persuaded any one who is even very slightly acquainted with them, *cannot with any sincerity dispute it.*" (p. 20.) This fact is, that "the Roman Pontiff seems" to any one who reads Church History, "possessed himself, as from a living tradition which had thoroughly penetrated the local Roman Church, with a consciousness of some peculiar influence which he was to exercise on the whole Church," in that they, the line of Roman Pontiffs, "were the successors of St. Peter, who himself *sat and ruled and spoke in their person.*" (p. 19.) "The feeling of their brother bishops concerning them, *may have been less definite*, as was natural." (p. 20.)* Now here precisely is

* Mr. Allies, with his usual carelessness, has forgotten this very reasonable observation of his own, when commenting (p. 60.) on the extremely strong language used by Pope St. Innocent on the extent of his prerogative. These expressions, says Mr. Allies, "come from a Pope; in *St. Augustine's* mouth they would have had much more force." And he has no less forgotten the facts of the case; for St. Augustine, as Mr. Thompson reminds us, (p. 78,) expressly says, "he (the Pope) wrote back to us in such manner as was fitting, and as became the Prelate of the Apostolic See."

the interpretation of the few explicit anti-papal facts or sayings, which Mr. Allies has brought together. The "local Roman Church was thoroughly penetrated with a consciousness of some peculiar" and most signal "influence which" the Pope "was to exercise on the whole Church;" which he was to exercise, we will add, in virtue of that position in which he had been distinctly and explicitly placed by our Blessed Lord, as the essential centre of unity. On the one hand, in proportion as the Church was knit together externally and consolidated, through the cessation of persecutions, the eye of the faithful would be directed upwards, beyond their immediate pastors, to the acknowledged Primate of the Church, in search both of commands to obey and of guidance to follow; while on the other hand, each successive event would bring with it some new consciousness to the mind of the reigning Pontiff, as to the nature and extent of the post which God Himself had assigned to his keeping. Now, since the feeling of his brother bishops concerning him was naturally "less definite," it would frequently enough happen that the other parties concerned would be far less clear-sighted in their estimation of the Pope's legitimate prerogative, than was the Pope himself. Nor would anything be more reasonable or natural, or more like what happens every day, (and this remark is often to be found in the works of the old Catholic controversialists,) than that the Pope in argument with *them*, should base his claims on what was common ground to him *and* them; on what *they* acknowledged to be authority as well as *he* did; on ancient custom, or on the Nicene Canons, or on whatever other support presented itself; that he would *so* argue with them, we say, rather than insist on what (consciously or unconsciously) he felt to be the higher and the truer ground, but which *they* were not prepared to admit. Any fair and honourable means would a holy Pontiff be anxious to press, if by so doing he might hope to save the Church (humanly speaking) from shipwreck; and it would continually happen that the Church *could* only be saved from shipwreck, through his assuming that place of authoritative guidance in doctrine and governance in discipline, which had been assigned him by God Himself.

We have been the more anxious to express this specifically, because we think Mr. Thompson (p. 145-157) does not do full justice to Mr. Allies's argument, (or, rather,

the well-known Gallican argument, reproduced by Mr. Allies,) founded on the circumstance that general councils occasionally reconsidered questions, which the Pope had already decided. Indeed, Mr. Thompson on this head seems hardly consistent with himself. He ends his discussion (p. 158) by saying, very reasonably and forcibly, that the various "decisions, which proved the consent of the Church, proved also—not simply declared, but proved, with an amount of moral certainty not to be resisted—the marvellous fact, that the judgment of the Pope was the judgment of the Church." Now, surely, that which was in any sense proved by these decisions, could not have been so fully known *before* these decisions: and yet, in the earlier part of the argument, the author seems almost to contend that the assembled bishops in every case were conscious and explicit believers in the Pope's infallibility; a supposition which it certainly does seem difficult to reconcile with the facts of the case. M. de Maistre has a distinct chapter (livre i. chapitre 14.) to consider the argument in question; and replies to it by a very observable and profound reflection. Before proceeding, however, with this, as his name has thus occurred, one word in reference to Mr. Allies's repeated charges against his trustworthiness as an historian.

It may be quite true that this writer's *accuracy* of erudition is not so great as its extent and variety, which are indeed truly surprising; nor will we deny that we occasionally desiderate in him a sufficiently fair and attentive consideration of an adversary's position or argument; nay, and in his "*Du Pape*," we feel painfully at times a more serious omission—a tendency, namely, to consider his subject too exclusively in what may be termed its *political* aspect. Still, no one who has read his "*Soirées de S. Petersbourg*," can doubt that he has a most deep sympathy, appreciation, and reverence for Catholic doctrine, *as* doctrine. And, for the rest, he has an ever exuberant fountain of "*bon sens laïque*," to use his own expression, which gives him a singular and admirable instinct in detecting at one glance the real bearings of a period or of a controversy; and a historical genius, which enabled him to become the unquestioned originator of a system of historical interpretation, which subsequent writers have more fully and accurately worked out, and which is becoming daily more and more the one acknowledged exponent of

the political effects and influence of Christianity: a system which has thrown light on a whole period formerly given up as obscure and unintelligible, and has, for the first time, traced back modern European civilization to its primary and essential elements. That every thing at once valuable and characteristic in the present features of the human society is mainly the creation of the Catholic Church—such is the great discovery made by De Maistre; and which subsequent enquirers—Catholic, Protestant, and Infidel—Montalembert, Guizot, Comte—are but illustrating and confirming.

Here is the passage of De Maistre to which we were referring:

“La plupart des écrivains Français, depuis le temps surtout où la manie des constitutions s’est emparée des esprits, partent tous, même sans s’en apercevoir, de la supposition d’une loi imaginaire, antérieure à tous les faits et qui les a dirigés; de manière que si le Pape, par exemple, est souverain dans l’Eglise, tous les actes de l’histoire ecclésiastique doivent l’attester, en se pliant uniformément et sans effort à cette supposition; et que, dans la supposition contraire, tous les faits de même doivent contredire la souveraineté.

“Or, il n’y a rien de si faux que cette supposition, et ce n’est point ainsi que vont les choses; jamais aucune institution importante n’a résultée d’une loi, et plus elle est grande, moins elle écrit. Elle se forme elle-même par la conspiration de mille agents, qui presque toujours ignorent ce qu’ils font; en sorte que souvent ils ont l’air de ne pas s’apercevoir du droit qu’ils établissent eux-mêmes. L’institution végète ainsi insensiblement à travers les siècles; ‘crescit occulto velut arbor ævo,’—c’est la devise éternelle de toute grande création, politique ou religieuse.”

In a passage which immediately follows, he makes it quite plain how far he is from maintaining, that the earlier popes in general placed distinctly before their minds in each case any general principle, in virtue of which they acted; rather he considers that they felt unmistakeably, in the present circumstances of the case, *here and now*, that such was the course required by their divinely-appointed position, and acted or spoke accordingly. Much less, therefore, need it be supposed, that the other public characters of the day had before their minds any distinct enunciation of a principle, to which, nevertheless, in numberless cases, they may have been unconsciously yet really deferring. And he represents the opposite way of looking at church history as a peculiar habit of the Gallicans; and

as owing in great measure to the mania for written constitutions and codes, which was characteristic of the French at that period.

We are thus brought directly into the presence of a principle, which has made some little stir among Catholics at the present time, under the name of "developments;" a stir rather owing, we must think, to the novelty of the name and, perhaps, of some applications which have been made of the general principle, than to any novelty in the general principle itself, which is as old as Catholic theology. We had intended in this place to enter at some little length into the subject; but have judged it best on the whole to allot a separate article to its consideration. To that article therefore we refer our readers, as to an indispensable complement of the present. Especially, as various Anglican writers have lately maintained or implied, that the historical arguments, adduced by writers of their school, have driven Catholics to the necessity of devising a new theory, we invite their attention to the passages we have there adduced; which suffice to show that the said theory was fully recognised by doctors of the highest repute in the Church, centuries before they or their arguments were heard of. In the meantime we conclude this branch of our subject with one final observation.

There can be no question, certainly, that the Apostles explained distinctly and expressly to their converts the place held in the Church by the Successor of St. Peter, as the divinely appointed Primate and Centre of unity. On the other hand, in order to estimate aright the *extent* of their disclosures on this subject, we must bear in mind the following consideration. There is nothing more indubitable, nor, in fact, more undoubted, than that the Apostles gave no such information as to the *duration* of the Church's life, as to prevent each successive generation of Christians from having a continual and anxious expectation, that in *their time* Christ was coming to judgment. It follows of course from this, or rather is involved in it, that no knowledge was given as to the future condition and privileges of the Church, which should in any way imply her protracted continuance. That the Church was to be coeval indeed with Christianity itself, or (to speak more truly) that Christianity could have no existence apart from it; moreover, that the Church was ever to remain the one appoint-

ed and sufficient guide on all matters of faith and morals ;—this was unquestionably declared. And in proportion as Christians came to realize and reflect upon this doctrine, of course (as we have more than once observed) they would feel that it necessarily implied the gift, inherent in the supreme tribunal of the Church, of interpreting infallibly the apostolic teaching. Still, while the impress and memory of that teaching was fresh and lively in the minds of all, permeating the Church as if with a certain atmosphere of Truth, the office of their rulers as guardians and transmitters of that sacred deposit would be consciously and habitually contemplated by all, rather than that gift of infallible interpretation. And there are many parts of early church history on which this remark will throw light.

There cannot be a more forcible illustration of the general principle of development, than a subject which Mr. Allies absolutely forces on our notice ; the Gallican rebellion against the Pope. Mr. Thompson, though a staunch adherent of pure Catholic doctrine, yet treats this Gallican movement with a tenderness and gentleness, for which ourselves we have really no heart. Of all the pictures in history we know none more sickening, than the sight of such a prelate as Bossuet, rebelling against his acknowledged Ecclesiastical Superior, isolating himself with petty nationality from the rest of Christendom, and bearing part in acts of the most paltry and cowardly sycophancy to the secular power ; nay, and defending his course on what we must call the pitiful pretext of an appeal to Antiquity. However, putting aside the moral aspect of the case, let us look at it as a mere question of theology and of history. The King claims a right throughout his Kingdom, which before he had enjoyed in parts of it, to enjoy the revenues and patronage of a see during its vacancy. Those who, in obedience to the Pope, resist this innovation, are imprisoned in considerable numbers ; and the king proceeds to call together an ecclesiastical council, which, under the auspices of Bossuet, proclaims these Gallican “*Liberties.*” The Pope refuses to confirm Louis’s bishops elect ; whereupon the latter, by his own prerogative, confers on his nominees the spiritual supervision of their new dioceses. Such are the proceedings which are gravely represented, (Mr. Allies him-

self seems so to represent them,) as a return to the "pure times of St. Cyprian and St. Augustine!" Can any thing show more plainly, how ludicrously impossible it is really to return back upon the past? Each age has its own advantages and its own evils; and you do not advance one step towards ridding yourself of the latter, by choosing to surrender the former. Give up modern definiteness and precision of doctrine, you are no whit the nearer to (rather so much the farther from) the freshness and liveliness of earlier tradition. Give up obedience to the Pope, you only lose the more effectually that ancient, free, ecclesiastical spirit, which was the old bond of union between orthodox bishops in communion with St. Peter's See; you only change a mild ecclesiastical superior for a secular and tyrannical master; you sell the church into subjection to the world, and set yourselves at variance with the whole episcopal body through all the rest of Christendom.

The same is the case with the worthy Pereira, whose work we named at the head of our article. "Don Joseph," says his English Editor, "had forbidden his subjects under heavy penalties, to have recourse to the Pope under any circumstances whatever. Three or four years past, and people who wished to intermarry within the prohibited degrees could get no dispensations. In this emergency the king and *the equally able and unscrupulous Pombal*, turned their eyes on Pereira;.....if any divine could assist in the dilemma, it was clearly he." (p. ix.—x.) Such is the respectable origin of the work; and of course, as we turn over the leaves, all the well-known names in this hackneyed controversy, Cyprian, Cornelius, Felicissimus, Novatian, Victor, Decretals, and the rest of it, meet our eyes. Looking through the table of contents, we find, "The Seventh Principle. When access and recourse to Rome is prevented by kings and sovereign princes, it is *not the part of bishops to inquire into the justice of the case, but to obey*, and provide in the interim what is needful for the spiritual welfare of their people." Worthy advocate of the episcopal cause! surely the very spirit of St. Irenæus and St. Cyprian breathes in such passages as these. So would *they* have demeaned themselves towards the secular monarch, who should have forbidden their intercommunion with each other, and with the Holy See! Mr. Landon, the translator, must feel himself very oddly assorted with principles of this kind; though it is truly wonderful in

what disreputable company many a well-meaning man will remain, rather than give up a favourite theory.

It is a consolation, however, to hear that the book was publicly burned at Rome (p. xi.); and a still greater to find Mr. Allies's full admission (p. 185) that "the ultramontane theory alone has now life and vigour in the Roman Church. It seems to absorb into itself all earnest and self-denying minds, while the other is left to that treacherous conservatism which would use the Church as a system of police for the security of worldly interests." When and where was it anything better?

It must not be forgotten, too, that, since Bossuet's time, a very remarkable fact has occurred, which makes the mind of the Church still clearer than before against Gallicanism; we allude to Pope Pius 7th's suppression of the French sees, against the will of many of the bishops: a fact to which Mr. Allies alludes. (p. 51.) There was not a Catholic living who was not bound to treat, and who did not in fact treat, those who separated from the Church on this ground, as external to the one way of salvation. Yet what did they do but remain faithful to their Gallican principles? Doubtless a person may hold these principles without being an actual heretic; but it is difficult to see how he can act upon them without becoming an actual schismatic.

It is remarkable that, confidently as Mr. Allies seems to build upon history, he confesses at the end of his work, (p. 192.) "that he would give up the strongest individual conviction" on that head, were it not for the life and success of the schismatical Greek Church. Here it is that Mr. Renouf joins issue with him; and we heartily wish we had space for a full comment on his excellent pamphlet. As to Mr. Allies's notion that schismatical Greece converted Russia, Mr. Renouf enters at some length into the subject, and conclusively refutes it. (p. 14-17.) Though were the case otherwise, as Mr. Renouf observes (p. 15), "the *Arians* converted and helped to civilize the *Sabæans*, the *Alani*, the *Suevi*, the *Goths*, the *Vandals*, the *Burgundians*, and the *Lombards*; and the *Nestorian* missions were crowned with such success in their day, that the converts to their creed from paganism, together with the *Jacobites*, were once thought to have out-numbered the *Christians* of the *Latin* and *Greek* communions."

Mr. Allies makes much of the point, that, if the Roman Church have preserved the note of *unity*, she has lost that of *Catholicity*. Indeed! Surely, then, on the day of Pentecost she had it not! How could a church, confined to one city, in one obscure province of the Roman empire, be Catholic? As Mr. Thompson observes (p. 192), "the Church is therefore Catholic, because wherever it extends it preserves its identity; it has the property of universal diffusiveness, and is the Church, not of this or that locality, nor of this or that nation, but of the universe;" because it is "the Church of all nations, and people, and languages; because it is at all times and in all places *potentially Catholic*." Hear Mr. Renouf on this head:

"To those who think that the question is affected by numbers, I would offer the consideration of a possible case. The population of China is supposed to exceed three hundred and eighty millions, and, consequently, to outnumber all the existing Christian Communions put together. If the Emperor of China became a Christian, and, like the first Christian sovereign of Russia, made the profession of Christianity obligatory upon his subjects, we should have more Christians in China than in all the remainder of the world. How is it, I ask, an inconceivable or extravagant hypothesis, that a future Emperor and a handful of obsequious bishops should start a heresy or schism, in which their ignorant but obedient population should be involved? And if so, are they still to be considered as belonging to the Christian Church, for the paltry reason, that the exclusion of three hundred millions would ruin the catholicity of the Church?

"There is, in fact, no necessity for going so far as China, to see the futility of judging by numbers. You surely do not believe that perpetuity is promised to the Russian Church. There is no divine promise to secure it from falling into schism or heresy. If you once allow that it *may* fall, in spite of its extent and numbers, it is very bad logic to appeal to its extent and numbers, as a proof that it has not fallen.

"I am addressing those who pay deference to ecclesiastical history, and I call upon them to test the validity of their defence by the history of sects which they themselves consider heretical and schismatical. The Donatist Communion, with its four hundred bishops, formed in its day as large and as active a portion of Christendom as does the Greek Church in our day. They had as much right as any one to talk of the gain of unity at the expense of catholicity. They had valid orders, valid sacraments, pious ascetics, consecrated virgins, vows of chastity, martyrs for the faith. They had the most complete conformity of worship, and all but complete conformity of belief, with the existing Catholic Church. On the

matter of controversy between them and Catholics, both Scripture and the earliest fathers were utterly silent. On *their* side was the undoubted authority of St. Cyprian and Firmilian, not to speak of Councils which represented the traditions of the African and Eastern Churches. The more moderate, like yourselves, admitted the catholicity of the Transmarine Churches; yet St. Optatus and St. Augustine refute them, by pointing to the Chair of Peter, and the indivisible unity of the Church of Christ. What ecclesiastical argument can be advanced for the Church of England, which is not available for the Church of Tichonius and Parmenian?*

"At a later period of the Church, 'when all the West and South were in possession of the Arians and all the East in possession of traitors to Chalcedon,' did the Church lose for a moment its essential note of catholicity? You say: 'It is a complete refutation of Rome's claim to be by herself Catholic, that there exists out of her Communion a body of Apostolic descent and government (viz. the Russian Church,) with the same doctrinal system as her own, with the ascetic principle as strongly developed, with the same claim to miracles, with all, in fact, that characterises a Church; a body, moreover, so large, that, supposing the non-existence of the Roman Communion, the promises of God in Scripture to His Church might be supposed to be fulfilled in that body.' Was it then a complete refutation of the claims of the Catholic Church, that the Monophysites possessed the Churches of Asia and of Egypt,—that they sat on the Apostolic thrones of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Ephesus,—that they ruled the monasteries of St. Anthony and St. Pachomius? They celebrated the Eucharistic rite with the liturgies of St. James and St. Mark; they spoke the theological language of St. Athanasius and St. Cyril; they exhibited and still continue to exhibit that un-Protestant appearance which you admire in the Greek Church; they are most ardent advocates for the ancient patriarchal system; 'they have the same body of doc-

* The common reply to this is extremely pitiable: "We, High Church Anglicans, do not confine the Catholic Church to England; we include in it the Greek and Roman Communions; whereas the Donatists looked upon all Christendom but themselves as apostate. They called Church Antichrist," &c. The fact is, that the history of Anglicanism is most strikingly similar to that of Donatism. The *first* Donatists, like the *first* Anglicans, condemned all Catholic Christendom as apostate; they said nothing worse than what is said in the homilies; nor is there any proof that they required a subscription to this opinion from their clergy or people, any more than the Anglican Church has done. In process of time a party sprung up, which admitted the Churches *beyond the sea* to be parts of the True Church, so that the parallel is complete.—(Mr. Renouf's Note.)

trine,* the same seven sacraments, the same real presence, the same mighty sacramental and sacerdotal system, the same dogmatic and hierarchical fabric,' which you consider tokens of a True Church. In short, one could plead their cause in precisely the same words in which you plead for the Greek Communion. If the argument be insufficient in one case, it is equally so in the other.

"Neither can *duration*, any more than extent or numbers, be admitted to affect the question. Duration, extent, and numbers are necessary, but not sufficient, conditions of catholicity. The existence of the Russian Church for eight or nine centuries is no proof of its truth. It is not nearly so wonderful that it should still exist after eight or nine centuries of almost undisturbed tranquillity, as that the *Monophysite Communion* should still exist after fourteen or fifteen centuries, during which it has undergone the most fiery persecutions.

"You state that the see of Constantinople was *never* subject to the Pope, and that the Greek Church never ceased to protest against the Papal Supremacy from the moment that it first began to be claimed. Yet St. Gregory the Great assures us,† that the Emperor and Archbishop of Constantinople were both earnest in their profession of submission to the Apostolic See. 'De Constantinopolitanâ ecclesiâ quod dicunt quis eam dubitet Sedi Apostolicæ esse subjectam? quod et piissimus Dominus Imperator et frater noster ejusdem civitatis episcopus assidue profitentur.'—pp. 9-12.

Another of Mr. Allies's "points" is thus alluded to:

"In common with other writers of your school of theology, you

* I use this expression in the same sense as that in which you speak of the Catholics and Greeks having the *same* doctrine. I cannot suppose that you used these words as overlooking the importance of the doctrine of the "Double Procession." Some recent Anglican writers, from their total ignorance of theology, have represented the dispute as one about words, and they have misquoted Catholic schoolmen and divines in support of their opinion. They might with equal justice have represented St. Athanasius as careless about the doctrine of the "Homoeousion," because he dispensed with the use of that *expression* in the case of some who undoubtedly held the doctrine. The case is totally different, when Latins and Greeks, after hearing each other's explanations, still recognise the difference of belief to be so serious as to justify their anathemas. Besides, it is exceedingly unfair to talk, as if *we* only anathematised the Greek Church. The Greek Church is anathematised in the Athanasian Creed as retained by the Church of England.—(Mr. Renouf's note.)

† St. Gregor. Lib. ix. Ep. 12, ed. Ben.

consider that the scandals which exist in different Christian countries present a strong confirmation of (what we, as Catholics, cannot help calling) that frightful heresy, which teaches that there is no longer a Church, which is *One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic*.

“ ‘Does the ‘obscene rout’ of Ronge and Czersky, bursting forth from the bosom of the Roman Church, awake no misgiving? ‘How has nearly the whole intellect of France become infidel? From the French Revolution, it will be answered. But how could that great Satanical outburst have ever taken place, had the Church of Christ.....been discharging its functions, I do not say aright, but with any moderate efficiency?’ Objections like these can only result from a very inadequate view of the mission of the Church, of the scandals which have afflicted it in *every* period of its history, and of the marked distinction between these scandals and those which exist out of its bosom. To judge from the writings of some Anglicans, one would be led to fancy, that, ‘before the Church was divided,’ all its members, or at least the majority, were exceedingly religious people, not to say martyrs or confessors. The prevalence of this erroneous idea makes it necessary to point out its essentially *Donatist* character. The Church has *never* been free from corrupt members. The tares are destined to grow with the wheat until the last day. The very ages of martyrdom had to bewail the crying scandal which the author of ‘*Ancient Christianity*’ has made familiar to Protestant readers. And when persons contrast the purity of the ‘undivided Church’ with the ‘immoralities of Italy and Spain,’ I would simply refer them to the pictures drawn by St. Chrysostom of the Christians of the East, and by Salvian of Christians in the West, at a time ‘when the Church was most pure in faith and practice.’ The holiness of the Church does not consist in the absence of flagrant immoralities, but in the presence of supernatural holiness, within her pale.

“The ‘obscene rout of Ronge and Czersky,’ bursting forth from the bosom of the Catholic Church, is certainly anything but a proof that the bosom of the Catholic Church was congenial to that miserable band of apostates. The Apostle argues in a manner* very different from yours: ‘They went out from us,’ says St. John, ‘but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.’ Their departure, however fatal to themselves, was a blessing not only to the communion which they left, but to many Protestants who were led to reflect upon the subject. The same year which saw their schism

* 1 John ii. 19. The fathers of the Church have related very startling obscenities of the Gnostics and Manichees, yet they never dreamed that any one would feel “a misgiving” at such “an obscene rout bursting from the bosom of the Catholic Church.”

witnessed a re-action, and in Berlin alone four hundred families were received into the Catholic Church."—pp. 21, 22.

We avoid here any discussion with Mr. Allies on the practical state of the schismatical Greek and Russian Churches, because such conflicting statements are made on the subject, that it would not be fair to express a positive opinion where there is no room to state its grounds.

We are grieved to find how little space we have to devote to Mr. Lewis's pamphlet. As a matter of argument, indeed, it is superfluous. The *Gallican* principle, indeed, has at least some show of resemblance, some hollow and external parallelism, to the principle of the Fathers; but a person who can believe that the doctrine of "sovereign and independent bishops" is patristic, will readily believe the royal supremacy, nay, if requisite, the Mahometan religion, to be patristic also. But the Catholic will read with feelings of pity, mixed with amusement, how that Henry VIII., "in his own person unable to do all things, calls on the bishops 'ut vices nostras in ea parte suppleant,'" (p. 32); and how an act of parliament was passed to declare the "consecration" of Parker and others to be "*good and perfect to all intents and purposes*," (p. 73); and how, in George the 3rd's reign, parliament ordered that a bishop should be sent to India, "provided always and be it enacted that such bishop shall not have or use any jurisdiction, or exercise any episcopal function whatsoever.....but only such jurisdiction and functions as shall be limited to him by His Majesty," (p. 42); and how, even in the present reign, our gracious Queen has been anew invested with patriarchal power, by the enactment of parliament that "it shall be lawful for Her Majesty.....to appoint one of the bishops of the same province.....to exercise all the functions and powers with regard to thespiritualities of the incapable bishop;" and divers other curious and entertaining matters which Mr. Lewis with great care and accuracy has brought together.

In truth, we sincerely pity and sympathize with Mr. Allies. It is his peculiar praise that he does not blind himself to the enormities of the Anglican system, though unable to discern a way of escape. He professes, indeed, that his Church is not committed to them, and that the present "state of the English Church" is "confessedly

provisional and temporary." But, "Is it requiring too much," asks Mr. Renouf—

"Is it requiring too much to ask, *by whom* its isolation from Catholic Christendom is *confessed* to be provisional and temporary? Certainly by individuals who have no more right to represent the voice of their Church, than their Erastian and Evangelical co-religionists. You say that 'the Church of England has *never* rejected the communion of the Western and still less of the Eastern Church; neither has the Eastern Church pronounced against her.' In one sense, it is true that the Church of England has not rejected the Communion of East or West, for there is absolutely no act of hers by which she has rejected *anybody's* Communion. *This is common to her with Socinians.* But, in the sense in which you probably understand it, facts are surely at variance with your statement."—p. 6.

We confess that, if those in general who remain members of the "Anglican High-church" party, displayed as much sensitiveness and candour as Mr. Allies, we should fear much less than we do (to speak plainly) for their salvation. We desiderate in them the appearance of straightforwardness and real desire for truth; we desiderate in them the appearance of looking their own position fairly in the face; we desiderate in them a continuance of that genuine confession, which we used to hear from them, of the claims of Rome on their spiritual sympathies. This has been observed by the "Recent Convert:—"

"Those of us who have been admitted to the society of their former Anglican friends, have been much struck by observing the great alteration which many have undergone in their views, not merely about the Church of Rome, but about Church principles altogether. Instead of receiving the Holy See as the great authority of Christendom, and indulging the hope of re-union with it as the consummation of earthly happiness, they now speak of the Catholic Church in a tone of indifference and almost of antipathy, as a power of which England has been well rid, and of which she does well in being shy. Instead of living in Catholic devotions, as they formerly considered it no breach of duty to their own immediate communion to do, they now eschew them as so many temptations to restlessness; and instead of leaning to the practices of the Church of Rome, they are now rather in danger of deserting ecclesiastical principles altogether.

"But I will meet you on ground which is more public and unquestionable. You will feel, I am sure, with me, that a corresponding change has come over your current ecclesiastical literature. The periodicals, for instance, which represent the opinions of your

party, and which there is no need that I should specify, exhibit more and more of antipathy or indifference to the Roman Catholic Church in this country. Far from making friendly advances towards it, your writers seem to ignore its very existence; and, though they know very well that it is, in its doctrines and rites, at least, the faithful representative and successor of the anti-reformation Church, have the effrontery to speak as if either the Establishment were the successor, or there were none at all. It is very easy to be eloquent in praise of the continental churches, which are out of the way. What your writers have to do, and what they disingenuously avoid, is to encounter the fact of those ordinances, which they affect to admire in the ancient Church of England, having been preserved in all their integrity, not in the Establishment, but by a body of despised yet devoted men in this country, whom they choose to call aliens and schismatics. To those who are cherishing the hope of union with Rome, such tokens should, I think, be in the highest degree discouraging.

"On the other hand, there are significant appearances of a declension among you, not merely of especially Roman, but of ecclesiastical principles in general."—pp. 13, 14.

But, if we have estimated rightly Mr. Allies's fair dealing with himself, we cannot allow ourselves to doubt the final issue. Catholic sympathies being supposed, an honest heart is far more to the purpose than a clear head; even if it were not fair (as it is) to attribute very much of Mr. Allies's mistiness to the perplexity of his position, and to the stupefying effect of the study of Anglican divines. If God have really granted him the grace of a pure intention, in addition to the grace of much enlightened perception of true doctrine and principles, and if Mr. Allies continue faithful to that grace, no good Catholic can doubt that the crowning grace will follow.

ART. II.—*Irish Popular Songs, with English Metrical Translations, and Introductory Remarks and Notes.* By EDWARD WALSH. Dublin: 1847.

THE present work is one of the many symptoms, which the present time affords, of an increasing taste for the study of Irish Literature. We have on many previous occasions taken opportunities of expressing our satisfaction at the promise of a better order of things, which we thought

we were able to discern. If men, that never were known to meet together in any possible contingency, or for any object however urgent, and whose political and religious tendencies diverge widely as the poles asunder, have within the last few years been found at the same council table, putting their heads together, and discussing earnestly and amicably, the most effectual means of rescuing the literary monuments of our country from oblivion, and encouraging the study of its language, is not this a proof that the flood of bitter waters that overspread the land is beginning to subside? The injuries sustained by the social relations of the country have not indeed disappeared, nor been repaired, nor will they for centuries to come, but we can discover an anxiety in many instances to forget the evils which cannot be repaired, and to unite for the accomplishment of the good which can even now be effected. The children are becoming insensible to the appeals which were wont to excite the stormiest passions of their ancestors, and turn a deaf ear to the party, or the battle cry, that in the olden time would have urged them on to madness. Irishmen begin to find that the points in which they have a common interest, are far more numerous than those on which they are compelled to differ, and that without compromising in any manner their deliberate or conscientious convictions, they can labour much together for the benefit of their common native land. The attention which has of late been devoted to the study of Irish literature, may seem to some, a subject of comparatively little importance; but viewed in its least favourable light, we doubt not it will prove like the olive branch brought by the returning dove into the ark, the symbol of harmony and hope for the future.

The little volume before us, which has elicited these observations, must be received, and principally valued, as evidence of returning nationality. It promises, rather than has achieved, much. Yet, however small the present contribution to our national literature, we hope that the feelings which urged the author to this performance, will urge him also to a continuation of his labours. The present collection consists of forty popular songs, with metrical translations. Some of these songs have already appeared in public; and with them all, the Irishman who has spent much of his time in the rude homesteads of the peasantry, or is in any measure familiar with their language, will find himself acquainted. The metrical translations alone are

new. These translations are of fair average merit, and though not pretending to any high poetical excellence, have succeeded in rendering pretty correctly the sense of the original, and preserving it as faithfully as metrical versions can be expected generally to do. Nearly all the songs are of an amatory character, and though the author seems anxious to give some of these an allegorical meaning, by supposing the minstrel's lady-love to be none other than his native land, we are disposed to think that there was more of flesh and blood about the personage that inspired his muse, than he is disposed to acknowledge. There can be little doubt that the warm and vivid colouring of the original, the deep and earnest feeling that pervades it, the life-like portrait of rustic beauty so vigorously drawn, and the minute detail of personal attractions, which are found in the text, must have had a more actual existence than the ideal representation of the poet's fancy. No doubt in the insecurity of those troubled times, when the child of song was a proscribed and outcast member of society, and the objects of his political enthusiasm, the unfortunate house of Stuart, as proscribed and outcast as himself, the language of allegory was that which naturally presented itself, as the vehicle of his thoughts and aspirations. The feelings of the desponding lover would serve to express those of the desponding patriot, and devoted loyalty may be supposed to vent itself in the outpourings of tender and affectionate expression, as well as devoted love. Very many of the Jacobite relics are of this description. It may be that the bards of this period had a common conventional mode of expressing the political feelings and hopes of that day, that this language was very intelligible to the initiated, and answered the purposes of public communication, while by its secondary and obvious meaning, it protected the authors from the penalty of sedition. But it is surely straining this principle too far, to make it apply, as some do, to almost all the amatory productions of the Irish muse. We do them no injustice in supposing them to have been sometimes animated by other than political passions, and that their powers of song were occasionally exercised on objects not always of an imaginary character.

The number of poetical compositions in the Irish language is very considerable. Whether owing to the wonderful facility afforded by the language itself, or the poeti-

cal temperament of the people, or the influence of those institutions which are said to have been formerly established for the cultivation of poetry, we know not; but the fecundity of the Irish muse is absolutely astonishing. There is as much unpublished poetry at present in the kingdom, composed within the last two centuries, as would fill many volumes. When we consider the general insecurity of the times, the absence of national encouragements, nay, even the positive danger to which the poor bard was too frequently exposed, it is surprising that we should have so much. And if so much has reached our times, and been rescued by hurried and irregular copying from destruction, it is not unreasonable to suppose that much more has been utterly destroyed. What would not the Irish bard have been, if fortune had smiled upon his efforts, and beckoned him up the ascent of fame, with accents and gestures of fond encouragement?

The limits to which we are confined will permit us to give but a few specimens of our author's powers of metrical translation. The following song is the composition of a bard that was born blind. William Heffernan, or, as he is more popularly known, Blind William, was a native of the county of Tipperary. He is the author of a poem called Carrig Cliona, the fame of which has extended far beyond the limits of his native county. The following song, though not equal to it, is yet of very considerable poetical merit. We give the original and the translation.

ԱՂԱՆ-ՀԱՇ ԱՅԻ ԱՄԻՅԻՂ

ԱՆՆԱՄ ԵՂԱՆ յՈ ԵՂԱՆ

1.

Այի Երուհե զն Կոլլե մօյի,
 Ին քրտած-Երտած Երօն,
 Եո թեղած շուր զն Եւրիսի,
 Են իւրիսի Եոմ ին Եո,
 Ին Եոլ զն Երիտ ի իւրիսի
 Այ զն յօր զն Եո ին զն-Անիշեհի
 Եո Եո Եոլ Են Եոմ Եո Եւրիսի Եոմ,
 Են յ-Եւրիսի Եոմ Ե-Երիտ.

THE VOICE OF JOY.

1.

By Kilmore's woody highland
 Wandering dark and drear,
 A voice of joy came o'er me,
 More holy to mine ear
 Than wild harp's breathing
 dreamy,
 Or blackbird's warbling
 streamy;
 No seraph's choir could frame
 me
 Such soft music dear!

2.

44'á'n ceol do tuáid rúáiz ríi
 Tár mór mórí o'n íóim,
 44'á'n ppoirt do deímd zruázáid
 2i z-epuáid-lí ná ríuáz
 44'á'n zéóim do léizid eukáa
 Zo nuád coir coille á m-bhuáe enoie;
 2'í zác híon zup ení mo eukáid díom
 Munk m-beád Mállkúze beáz 0!
 More sweet than anthems holy
 Brought seaward from Rome,
 Than spells by wizards spoken
 O'er stolen maiden's doom,
 Or cuckoo's song inspiring
 Where woods green hills
 environ—
 Save love for one fair syren
 It banish'd my gloom.

3.

4'áite beáe do ludáz hnn
 2hí tukáimz á d-epéóim,*
 2hí pözmarí do beád zo buáááááá
 2'í zán rúáleáí áiz íeon
 4'éóíre táí leáí dá ruázáá
 4'í áh coip do híoe zo buáeáe
 Zán oí ná báíte áíí buáá dóib
 4'í m tpuáz híom á m-bíon!
 The golden bees were ranging
 The air for a chief—
 'Twas freedom's trumpet woken,
 And dark tyrant's grief;
 And George, a homeless ranger,
 His tribe, the faithless stran-
 ger
 Far banished—and their danger,
 My glad heart's relief.

4.

2i 4'ponáill dá m'beidinn íntee
 4'áoi epuáá-leáe á z-coimeáá,
 2'í áh ízeál ío elor máí eukááá
 Zo rúááááí áíí íeol;
 4e íoííá á'í neáíí mo zúáille
 2hí íoá zo z-ááííííí rúáí díom
 2'í me teááá táí m'áíí zo luáááááá
 4'áoi tukáííííí áh 4'zeóil!
 If o'er me lay at Shronehill
 The hard flag of doom,
 And came that sound of sweet-
 ness
 To cheer the cold gloom—
 Death's darksome bondage
 broken,
 My deaf dull ear had woken,
 And at the spell word spoken,
 I'd burst from the tomb!

In this song it will be perceived that the translator has faithfully followed the metrical construction of the original. In this respect his translation possesses a very decided advantage over those of the Irish songs which Mr. Hardiman has published in his *Minstrelsy*.

The following ode to his native country was composed by Donagh Roe Mac Namara, a well-known Irish poet of the last century. He was a native of Waterford, and is better known as the author of an imitation of the *Æneid*, in which he gives a humorous description of the horrors of

* The poet seeing a swarm of bees confused and wild at the loss of the queen-bee, accepts the omen as a prognostic of the destruction of the English power in Ireland.

a sea voyage, and the real or imaginary dangers he encountered in a voyage to Newfoundland.

ḡán-enné ḡóibin Éiríonn
Doncáδ ḡuáδ ḡáε ḡáḡáḡá Cnt.

FAIR-HILLED PLEASANT
IRELAND.

1.

2.

ḡeiri ḡeáḡáεε ḡ'm eiríde ḡo éiri ná
h-éiríonn,

Take a blessing from the heart
of a lonely griever

ḡán-enné ḡóibin Éiríonn,

To fair-hilled pleasant
Ireland,

Cum á ḡáḡḡion ḡo ḡóḡáε ḡi á'ḡ Éirí*

To the glorious seed of Ir and
Eivir

ḡ m-ḡán-enné ḡóibin Éiríonn—

In fair-hilled pleasant
Ireland;

ḡn áε ḡon ári ḡ'áóibínn ḡínn ḡḡε éáḡ,

Where the voice of birds fills
the wooded vale

ḡáḡi 'ḡáḡ eḡḡε éáḡm áḡ eḡḡḡe ḡáóáεḡ,

Like the mourning harp o'er the
fallen Gael;

ḡe ḡo éáḡ á ḡeε ḡíḡe ḡíḡe á ḡeéḡ

And oh! that I pine many long
days' sail

ḡ ḡán-enné ḡóibin Éiríonn!

From fair-hilled pleasant
Ireland.

2.

2.

ḡíon ḡáḡḡá ḡoḡ ḡíḡm ári éáḡm-enné
Éiríonn,

On the gentle heights are soft
sweet fountains

ḡán-enné ḡóibin Éiríonn,

In fair-hilled pleasant
Ireland,

'ḡoḡ ḡeáḡiri ḡoná'n eiri ḡeo ḡíε ḡáε ḡleíḡe
ánn,

I would choose o'er this land the
bleakest mountains

ḡán-enné ḡóibínn Éiríonn,

In fair-hilled pleasant
Ireland,

ḡá ḡíḡḡe ná ḡeáḡáḡíḡ ári ḡeáááḡíḡ
eéóí,

More sweet than fingers o'er
strings of Song,

ḡíḡḡm áḡḡi ḡeḡḡḡeáε á ḡáεḡ 'ḡ á ḡḡo,

The lowing of cattle the vales
among,

ḡáḡi ḡáḡḡḡḡm ná ḡḡéḡḡe ḡḡeá áóḡáá
á'ḡ eḡ

And the sun smiling down upon
old and young

ḡḡi ḡán-enné ḡóibin Éiríonn!

In fair-hilled pleasant
Ireland.

3.

3.

ḡeáḡíḡ ḡáḡḡá ḡíḡḡḡáḡi á ḡ-εiri ná
h-éiríonn,

There are numerous hosts at
the trumpet's warning

ḡán-enné ḡóibin Éiríonn,

In fair-hilled pleasant
Ireland;

ḡ'ḡ ḡeáḡáεḡm ḡḡíde ná éḡóídeḡeáε
eéááεá,

And warriors bold, all danger
scorning

ḡḡi ḡán-enné ḡóibin Éiríonn—

In fair-hilled pleasant
Ireland.

* Eivir the son of Ir, who with his brothers the sons of Milesius, shared Ireland between them. Ir and his son Eivir had Ulster for their share.

<p> Má tuipe eiríde á' r mo eimneab íreál, láb áz zálk-pne íor fá zneim, mo- leun! U' r á m-báilte dá moim fá éor zó dáor, U m-bán-cnuc áoibn Eimonn! </p>	<p> Oh! memory sad, oh! tale of grief, They are crushed by the stran- ger past all relief, Nor tower nor town hath its native chief In fair-hilled pleasant Ireland. </p>
---	--

When so many and abundant materials are at hand, and so rich a field open to his labours, we should have expected a more copious and varied selection than the one before us. But we cannot regard the present volume in any other light than an experiment upon the public taste, soliciting its favour, and promising a continuation of similar exertion. In this respect it merits every reasonable indulgence, and shall receive it at our hands. The author is capable of rendering good service to the language of which he is so ardent an admirer. There are many of those, whose names he himself alludes to in his prefatory observations, that would well repay his editorial care, and merit the favour of being placed before the reading public in a good metrical translation. Such is the name we have just now alluded to. Such, also, is Timothy O'Sullivan. We would willingly see his poems rescued from the state in which they now are, and published in a fitting manner. In the earlier poets there are many pieces that we would gladly see introduced to the public, and sharing in that patronage which others less deserving have enjoyed; for instance, those of O'Daly, the abbot of Boyle. We hope the day will come when some competent individual will collect the works of this distinguished ornament of the Irish Church, and save them from the neglect and danger to which they are now unfortunately consigned. Many more might be added to this list. Those who are familiar with Irish literature, will need no reference to their works, and the mention of their names is here unnecessary.

The study of the Irish language is a subject strongly urged upon Irishmen by the publication of works like the present. Would that all our countrymen were able to peruse and understand the treasures of their national literature, and that a reading public was in existence to appreciate and encourage the exertions of editors such as the editor of the work before us. A knowledge of the Irish, such as would be sufficient to read a printed book or

understand a spoken word, would not detract from the possessor's previous stock of information, nor make him a less valuable or a less honoured member of society. To the Irish Catholic, more especially, it should be an object of affectionate and reverential regard. Surrounded as it is with solemn and sacred associations of those earlier periods of his country's history, when Ireland was "*Sanc-torum et Doctorum Insula*," and when the sainted men who spoke the Irish tongue were the apostles of religion and the ministers of Christian civilization to the nations of Western Europe. It is worthy of honour, too, as having been employed by Providence as one powerful means of preserving from the progress of corruption the religion of the people. It was their language that hedged it round with a fence far more impenetrable than even the mountain fastness or the rugged glen. The isolation produced by the diversity of language contributed in a great degree to preserve the inhabitants of this country from the seductions and fallacies of the missionaries of Protestantism. The clergy of the Established Church held out in vain the hand of fellowship, and proffered for acceptance the benefits of their communion. But they were aliens in language as well as in religion, and the alliance was spurned with disdain. It is probable (judging at least from human chances) that if English had been the common spoken tongue, the Reformation would have made more progress than it did, notwithstanding the attachment of the people to their ancient faith, and in spite of the most zealous exertions of their pastors. In that state of things the weak would be more exposed to temptation, and the worldly to corruption. But the difference of language was an obstacle not easily overcome. The priest who spoke to his flock in their rude cabin, or on the wild hill side, in a language which they knew, and which their fathers also knew, made an impression on their hearts; the minister of the new faith spoke in a language which they did not understand, and which was associated in their minds with many a bitter remembrance of insult and wrong.

Entertaining these feelings of respect and grateful attachment to the language of our native land, independently even of its literary merits and its etymological importance, we need scarcely say that we are pleased with this volume, however small and incomplete, because it affords us some grounds for believing that the Irish lan-

guage and literature are each day receiving more and more of public attention. We also accept it as some small promise that the translator will extend his labours, and continue his services, and that when he comes before us at some future time, he will have some more substantial claim upon our favourable notice and critical approbation.

ART. III. — *Brownson's Quarterly Review*. New Series. No. 1,
Art. 2. Greene, Boston, U. S.

IT is perhaps hardly according to the strict rules of etiquette, that we should head an Article with the name of a brother Quarterly Reviewer: but as we wish to offer a few comments on the above-named essay of Mr. Brownson's, the simplest plan is directly to specify it. And Mr. Brownson himself pursues a similar course from time to time, when he notices the attacks made on his theology by the various Protestant Reviewers of his country.

It is a more important matter for enquiry, *why* we take on ourselves to comment on the article in question. The answer however is easy. It is not that we are so presumptuous as to come forward in defence of the publication which is the immediate subject of Mr. Brownson's remarks; but because that gentleman has included others in his censure, who may fairly claim to be heard in their defence. With especial reference indeed to Mr. Northcote, but still with a wider scope, he speaks of "*a school* formed at first outside of the Church, but.....now brought within her communion; and compares, in regard to their dangerousness, the principles which he considers to be held by that school on the subject of *doctrinal development*, with those of Hermes and La Mennais." (p. 43.) Nor is this the charge of some obscure writer, whose censure might be regarded as little worthy of notice. Mr. Brownson's name must be held in high honour by every Catholic, were it only for his unwearied and unflinching championship of true doctrine, and the zeal and success with which he exposes the chief Protestant fallacies of the day. But still more is he recommended to our admiration by what implies even far higher qualities; his open

and unaffected expressions of sorrow for past intellectual wanderings, his frank and even vehement renunciation of former errors, his humble and loyal submission to the Church's teaching. It cannot be a matter of indifference to be regarded by such a person as radically unsound in faith.

It so happened, moreover, that at the very time Mr. Brownson's article reached this country, we were engaged in reviewing the treatises of Mr. Thompson and Mr. Lewis. Both these gentlemen are recent converts; and both happen to give expression to this very doctrine of "development:" Mr. Thompson especially, in a very beautiful passage which we have quoted at length in another article. It seemed impossible, under these circumstances, to avoid considering the arguments and objections which had been adduced.

Now it is to this allegation about "a school," to which we shall first allude. Certainly it is inevitable, and no one will say it is blameworthy, that if one regards any individual as possessed of rare spiritual excellence and of the highest intellectual gifts, we must attach considerable weight to his opinion on theological subjects. Certainly, also, it is inevitable, that, if a number of persons come from under the long-continued action of the very same set of influences, (be those influences good, or bad, or of a mixed nature,) they must resemble each other in a great number of minor opinions, ethical or philosophical, and they must consequently bear on them for a time the general appearance of a distinct *school*; however anxiously desirous they may be to mix themselves up with the general Catholic body, and to surrender themselves with all humility to the action of what one may call the Catholic *atmosphere* around them. But if it be meant that they rank themselves as the disciples of an individual—that they look up to any human authority as a final and authoritative guide—that they have any other desire, in matters of doctrine, than to learn the genuine spirit of the Church's teaching, in order that they may humbly submit to it their minds and their hearts—we are convinced that, however unintentionally, the greatest injustice is done them. And as to the particular theory before us, did not the present writer (who is one of these converts) consider himself to see it implied in the whole continuous history of the Church's

dogmatic definitions, and did he not find it expressly recognized by some of her greatest theologians, he would abandon it without question.

We will first, then, to avoid misconception, make as precise a statement as may be of the general principle which seems understood in the language of Mr. Thompson and Mr. Lewis—we will add, also, of Mr. Northcote: although those writers of course are in no way responsible for *our* interpretation of their sentiments. Next, we will bring together a sample of the high Catholic authority on which that principle rests. Lastly, we will make such brief observations as space will permit, on such testimonies adduced by Mr. Brownson as appear to lead towards an opposite conclusion. It will be impossible of course, as we are not writing a volume on the subject, to consider how the case stands, as to historical evidence, with the principal Catholic doctrines, one by one. Indeed, it is perhaps better that there is no room to make such an attempt: because, on matters of particular application, it must be of course expected that Catholics will mutually differ; whereas on the general principle, when both sides come to explain themselves, we really think that no essential difference will be found.

We make our statement, then, as follows.—We suppose we shall not be at all exaggerating the matter, if we say that the Apostles, by virtue of their inspiration, possessed a knowledge of the Christian Mysteries, as lively, lucid, and complete, as is consistent, in the nature of things, with the condition of pilgrims on earth, “*viatorum* :” inferior, indeed, even *in kind* to the perception of those Mysteries conveyed by the Beatific Vision; but far superior in *degree* to any such knowledge of the same Mysteries as can be obtained by their successors, unless God should think fit to visit any one of *them* with the same special illumination. This perception, moreover, we seem warranted in saying, was not conveyed to them by means of intellectual propositions, but rather by a direct impression on their spiritual nature.

Now, considering that their disciples had, in a vast number of instances, been converts from nothing less than heathenism, and that at a time when it wore one of its most corrupt and degrading forms; that, from dense and stifling darkness, they were brought directly within the influence of the purest light which ever visited this world;

that, whether in the region of morals or in that of faith, they must have been surrounded by objects inexpressibly startling and (one may almost say) bewildering to their enfeebled and clouded eyes—(and, even taking into full account the illuminating power of Baptism, this does not seem too strong an expression)—considering all this, it is quite contrary to what we should have expected, it is what we should never think of imagining unless history had plainly declared it, that the Apostle who converted them would have indoctrinated them with more than the very essentials of faith and morals; that he would have endeavoured, not merely to impress essential Truth on their spiritual nature, (which was, of course, an indispensable duty,) but to enlighten them as to its full intellectual expression, or its remote and indirect bearings. It may well be doubted, indeed, how such a process would be possible, unless *they* also, as well as the Apostle, were inspired; or, at least, unless some miracle were wrought in each case, reversing in their behalf the ordinary laws of human nature. And it is matter of notoriety that, instead of making it plain that the Apostles so acted, history, according to its natural and unforced interpretation, points strongly to the conclusion that they did *not*.

(1.) There are many things, indeed, which no Catholic Christian can doubt that each Apostle taught explicitly, and enforced with the utmost earnestness and distinctness. For instance, the general principles of Christian morals, and the practical rules which were required under existing circumstances. Again, the Apostles' Creed, as is well known, was a formulary of doctrines, such as were required to be explicitly believed in order to salvation. We do not, of course, mean merely that belief of the external *facts* there stated was inculcated as necessary to salvation, but belief in the *doctrines* which gave their real force and meaning to these facts: the doctrine that our Blessed Lord is Very God, and yet God *the Son*; that the Holy Ghost is Very God, yet that there is One Only God. There was, of course, no one object at which an Apostle would more earnestly aim, than that those whom he had converted to the Faith should have their very heart of hearts, their very innermost nature, penetrated with these primary and essential truths. And yet we should not naturally suppose, unless again history expressly declared it, that the means adopted for this purpose would be the

accurate and technical expression of those doctrines, or their intellectual analysis pursued to its utmost point. Rather would there be some more immediate address to the spiritual nature on the part of an inspired instructor; rather would he endeavour to spread among them, as it were, the contagion of those feelings of profound adoration towards the Blessed Trinity, which so intimately pervaded *his* whole nature; rather would he teach them, both by precept and (still more efficacious method) by the gradual and leavening influence of his own constant example, to offer Divine worship and pay Divine honour to the Son and to the Holy Ghost—that they should trust for salvation to the Atoning Merits of the One, and to the sanctifying graces of the Other, while they should still retain the deep and practical conviction that God is truly One.

Such, one can hardly doubt, was the teaching of the Apostles. But in succeeding ages, in proportion as the vivid remembrance of Apostolical example and *practical* Apostolic teaching began gradually to fade away; in proportion as that sensible *atmosphere* of doctrine, to which we just alluded, began to gather itself up, as it were, and collect itself around a few favoured haunts; the instruction of the many necessarily proceeded more and more by means of *intellectual statements and definitions*. Now of these we may say, that, even in their most perfect state, they are poor substitutes for the original instrument of teaching; while, moreover, it was only by a gradual and laborious process that they were brought into accuracy and uniformity. It is no real difficulty, then, in the way of our believing in the Apostolicity of the doctrines above specified, to acknowledge—in regard to those forms, not only of expression but of thought, which were adopted by various holy men in treating of them, and which were, as one may say, the projection upon the intellect of the original spiritual impression,—that in many cases they would of themselves point to a belief widely different from that really entertained by those who so adopted them. In speaking then, e. g., of the statements, in themselves erroneous, made by Ante-Nicene Fathers, such an idea never enters our mind, God forbid! as to impute to them any real doctrinal error. And yet, on the other hand, it is not mere *expressions*, but *opinions* of theirs on these high matters, which are in occasional contradiction with those finally sanctioned by the Church. What difficulty is there

here? The Apostles impressed on the Church, once for all, the true and full *idea*, e. g. on the Divinity and Filiation of our Blessed Lord; the detailed system, afterwards sanctioned by the Church, alone rightly expresses this idea, so as neither on the one hand to involve logical contradictions, nor yet, on the other hand, to lead, by necessary moral or intellectual process, to an absolutely heretical result. All this may be most true, as it is,—and yet the earlier Fathers, who may have had the true *idea* most fully impressed on their whole being, may yet have adopted certain *intellectual notions*, which in themselves were liable to one of these two objections. How can it be any want of reverence for these holy men to think so? No one has claimed for them either inspiration or infallible powers of logical discrimination;—while, had they *seen* the moral or intellectual consequences contained in these notions, much more had they been witnesses of a party embodying them and carrying them out, they would have disavowed them with horror. But heresy had not arisen in their time to require wary thought in such matters, nor peace and leisure to allow it; and we may add also that, by the merciful providence of God, at the very time when the intellectual expression of doctrine was most loose and unguarded, the propinquity to Apostolic times gave it a proportionably greater safeguard of another kind.

Now, with regard to this first mentioned species of development, (not here to discuss the question of fact how far there have been actually *discordant* opinions on matters of this kind, which have been subsequently ruled by the Church in one particular way)—consider the mere fact of the *silence* of earlier writers on many such matters. When opponents reply to this, that their silence arose from the fact of no question having arisen concerning them,—do they really mean, e. g., that all the early bishops held explicitly and consciously the doctrine that our Blessed Lord had *two wills*; and only did not think of mentioning it, for the same reason they would not think of mentioning that Rome is in Italy, on the ground of its universal notoriety? Nothing, surely, can be more grotesquely at variance than this with the most obvious facts of the case. No! surely, the definition of the Church *is* in one sense new, though in a far truer sense it is old: it is a new intellectual aspect and expression of the one ancient Truth; a new barrier and

protection to the old and venerable deposit ; an assistance, for the service of some, to a fuller and deeper apprehension of the original doctrine, and a safeguard, for the service of all, against the inroads of some new and fatal heresy, which threatened to destroy that doctrine. And those who have laboured in its formation, have laboured but to determine the true intellectual representation, in reference to the new questions which have arisen, of the one idea which fully possessed them ; and when they have succeeded, do but hail with joy this fresh picture of the one doctrine handed down to them from Apostolic times.

Another thing to be noted of doctrines which have been explicitly taught by the Apostles, is, that they may occasionally have been forgotten, by lapse of time, in this or that individual portion of the Church, and be revived there afterwards by the influence of the remaining Christian Body. Thus Dr. Döllinger, who cannot doubt that the Apostles taught distinctly the indissolubility of marriage, yet says that, after the earliest times, "the tradition of this indissolubility, as it was preserved in the churches of Rome and Africa, was the only one that could be followed with security. In other churches there was for a period a doubt, or permission was granted to dissolve the matrimonial bond and to marry again, in case of adultery."*

(2.) Next, of doctrines *implicitly* taught by the Apostles, take, as one example, the Catholic doctrine on Justification. The holy Council of Trent professes to deliver "veram sanamque doctrinam ipsius Justificationis, quam Sol Justitiæ Christus Jesus, fidei nostræ Auctor et Consummator docuit, Apostoli tradiderunt, et Catholica Ecclesia, Spiritu Sancto suggerente, perpetuo retinuit." Now, is there any one who understands by the clause cited here, that the Apostles delivered this doctrine to their converts in that definite and explicit form, in which the holy Council expounds it? Common sense surely shows us, that they left this "true and sound doctrine" as a legacy to the church, not by formally and methodically teaching it, but by giving these precepts, evidencing in their conduct those principles, holding forth as a pattern that general view of the Christian life, which, in point of fact, presupposed that one definite doctrine, impressed it on the hearts of their disci-

* Dr. Cox's translation of Döllinger's Church History, vol. 2. p. 343.

ples, and was consistent with no other. Apostolic Tradition surely is a vast system;—not to be comprised in a few sentences, nor to be embodied in one code or treatise;—permeating the whole Christian community, rather than at once consciously and formally recognized by them. It admits, indeed, of being analyzed in a measure by profound thinkers who give themselves up to the task—nay, and *forces* itself on the consciousness of devout and mortified men, so far as a heresy has sprung up in contradiction to it; but it *existed* in the Church as its name implies, long before it was analyzed; having been lodged in her by the Apostles themselves, and being the very mind of the Spirit of God. Here, then, is a second process, which may pass, if people will, by the name of “development;” the definite and systematic statement of what has been from the first implicitly held.

(3.) Another kind of “development,” not unlike the last though certainly not the same with it, is the authoritative application of old principles to new cases. An example of this is afforded, in the condemnation of propositions on moral subjects; which propositions often have no meaning, except in connection with the circumstances of modern society. Another example of this is the opinion held by many theologians that the proposition, e. g. “Pius IX. is the true successor of St. Peter,” is received by divine and infused faith. In both these cases is to be found what may be invidiously called, if it so please objectors, a new article of faith.

(4.) A fourth case is that, where the very course of circumstances has been the means of exhibiting in a new light, and investing with a greater depth of significance, some principle which has been consciously and distinctly recognized from the first. Examples of this are the relations between Pope and bishops, or between Church and State.

(5.) A fifth kind arises from the gradual action of the Christian mind upon revealed truths or principles. We are not speaking here of *logical*, but of *ethical*, results; of the gradual growth of an idea under the influence of religious meditation and practical realization. This consideration is especially required for those who desire (and what real Catholic but desires this beyond words?) to maintain and defend, in their full integrity, the glorious privileges awarded by Catholic consent to the Ever-blessed

Mother of God. There is nothing on which the Protestant controversialist more loves to dwell, than on the gradual growth within the Church of a belief in these privileges. It may be difficult—the most learned men certainly declare most strongly that it is difficult—to deny his premisses; let us, under the auspices of our greatest writers, join issue on his conclusion.

(6.) Lastly, the various kinds of “development” already mentioned, by bringing consciously before the mind propositions, which before were there only unconsciously, or even only potentially or in germ, lead to a last kind, viz., logical deductions from themselves.

Now, as it is with regard to these two last named kinds of “development” that the chief question will be raised, we will at once begin with them; we will defend the proposition, that in the judgment of the Church’s greatest divines, articles of faith may be ruled, which are the legitimate *results*, ethical or logical, of doctrines received from the first; but which have not themselves been so received.

If any one were asked the greatest names which have arisen in Dogmatic Theology since the Council of Trent, the names in every body’s lips, we suppose, would be Bellarmine, Vasquez, Petavius, Suarez. Read, for example, Father Perrone’s Lectures, (which may be taken as a fair standard of the general opinion on the subject,) one may say that hardly any other Post-Tridentine name occurs except these; and these are certainly always mentioned with the very greatest honour and respect. Moreover, of these, Petavius especially deserves regard where due respect to the holy Fathers is in question; because he bore a most prominent part in the task of drawing the attention of theological students to patristic studies: nay, and in the beginning of his works, as we understand him, he has some reflections in disparagement of Scholastic Theology, in which (to say the truth) we are quite unable to follow his authority. It is these four writers whom we shall first proceed to cite.

And we will commence with a tenet which is especially calculated to bring this question to an issue—a tenet which, although not as yet constituted an article of Faith, may be considered as universally received among the body of Catholics, as well as pointedly encouraged by the Church; and which is especially and inexpressibly dear to every

Catholic heart. We commence with the tenet of the Immaculate Conception of our loving and tender Mother, the Most Holy Virgin.

First, let us hear Petavius. He implies the opinion (which we shall find Vasquez and Suarez deliberately to express) that this tenet *may* at some future time be made an article of faith, by saying, (De Incarnatione, lib. xiv. cap. 2, sec. xi.) "Ad hunc itaque modum revelâsse credendus est Deus Christianis integrum illum immaculatæ Virginis conceptum; hoc est ejus tum notitiam aspirâsse, tum quam Græci *πληροφοριαν*, Latini 'firmam persuasionem' nominant: tametsi *nondum* (*not as yet*) plena et quæ in *Catholicum dogma transierit*, facta sit illius fides." Looking back to the beginning of the chapter, we find him citing various Fathers, from St. Augustine to St. Bernard, who *denied* the doctrine. (sec. vii.) With regard to the passages from the Fathers adduced on the other side, he says, that the upholders of the Blessed Virgin's privilege, "eorum dicta falsis interpretationibus, et alienis ab illorum mente, detorquent." (sec. ix.) "*Quamvis autem antiquioribus*," he says, (sec. viii.) "*opinio illa* [i. e., the denial of any such privilege] *placuit, postea tamen in contrariam partem complures iere Christiani*; ac paullatim tacito pioque plurimorum assensu ita percrebuit, *uti tandem in publicam professionem eruperit*." Presently, (sec. x.) "Admonet autem nos egregie Paulus Nolanus Episcopus, gravis imprimis auctor, ut de omnium fidelium ore pendeamus, quia in omnem fidelem Spiritus Dei spirat;" and proceeds to quote Cardinal Fisher to the same purpose. Then he adds, "Scitum illud est Augustini singulorum mentibus revelari quædam à Deo, non solum extraordinariis modis.....verùm etiam usitatis rationibus, *quando quod ignotum erat* vel orantibus ac pulsantibus, vel aliud agentibus, aperitur.....*Ad hunc itaq. modum*," according to our first quotation.

Before leaving Petavius, we may glance for a moment at a still more sacred doctrine; viz. the exemption of the Blessed Virgin from *actual sin*. This is actually declared by the Holy Council of Trent, to be the doctrine of the Church.*

* Si quis hominem semel justificatum dixerit.....posse in totâ vitâ peccata omnia, etiam venialia, vitare, nisi ex speciali Dei privilegio, *quemadmodum de Beatâ Virgine tenet Ecclesia*, a. s. (Sessio 6, can. xxiii.)

Petavius, however, tells us: "*Dixi hodiè Catholicum de eo dubitare neminem; Nam non videtur olim id in fidei dogma fuisse receptum: cum sanctissimi et alioqui B. Virginis studiosissimi Patres parum interdum de eo commode scripserunt, levissimis inducti rationibus, immò nullis, (lib. xiv. cap. i. sec. iii.)* He then proceeds to quote, as denying this doctrine which is now most indisputably Catholic, no less authorities than St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Proclus, and even St. Anselm.

Reverting now to the controversy on Her Immaculate Conception, turn to Vasquez, who discusses this tenet in his 117th Disputation on St. Thomas's *Third Part*. As to the question, whether it can at any time be ruled as an article of faith, he maintains, (chap. xiv.) in opposition to Canus, that it unquestionably *may* be so ruled; though the Pope having in former times, forbidden either party to call the other heretical, thereby declared "*non-dum* [not as yet] *esse sufficienter declaratum per Ecclesiam, ut tanquam dogma fidei à Deo verè revelatum à fidelibus credatur.*" He tells us, (chap. 6.) "*ex revelationibus quoque, miraculis, et communi sensu fidelium, non leve argumentum pro eadem sententiâ depromi potest;*" and, in explaining the latter, "*dico hunc esse sensum totius populi Christiani, non solum rudis et ignari, sed etiam Doctorum et Academicarum.....Et sanè hanc communem vocem totius populi, non sine Dei nutu et peculiari providentiâ percrebuisse quis dubitet?*" And just before, "*Quod sanè si antiqui illi magistri, præsertim verò S. Thomas, suo tempore vidissent, re jam per Ecclesiam magis patefactâ, quò magis sancti et docti essent, tanto magis cum reliquis fidelibus sentirent.*"

We now come to Suarez on St. Thomas, 3 Quæst. xxvii. Art. 2. "*Secundum fundamentum [of this tenet] ex Ecclesiæ auctoritate sumendum est, et primùm omnium magni ponderis est totius Ecclesiæ ferè universalis consensus. In quo consideratione dignum est antiquos Patres pauca de hoc Virginis privilegio esse locutos. Quod mirum esse non debet, tum quia Spiritus Sanctus paulatim suam Ecclesiam docet (ut Gregor. hom. 26 in Ezech.) tum etiam quia aliis fidei mysteriis gravioribus magisque necessariis explicandis ac defendendis distinebantur. Postquam vero ante quingentos annos veritas hæc clariùs cæpit doceri, ità insedit fidelium animis crevitque paulatim ejus fides,*

ut jam ferè omnium consensione recepta sit.....Credendum est ex Illius (S. Spiritus) inspiratione hunc fidelium universorum sensum affectumque manâsse." (sec.v.) "Dico tamen veritatem hanc.....*posse definiri ab Ecclesiâ*, quando id expedire judicaverit. Probatur, nam imprimis, Ecclesiam posse controversiam hanc in alterutram partem decidere, *apertè supponunt Sixtus IV. et Pius V. in suis decretis, et idem senserunt omnes Patres Concilii Basiliensis.....*Secundo...hæc veritas est supernaturalis.....*et pervenire res potest ad eum statum*, in quo, absque novâ et explicitâ revelatione, habeat Ecclesia sufficientia motiva ad veritatem hanc definiendam, *ex implicitâ et tacitâ Dei revelatione sibi sufficienter propositâ.....*Sæpe Ecclesia suâ auctoritate, assistente sibi Spiritu Sancto, similes controversias definivit, absque novâ revelatione expressâ: *ut potest manifestis exemplis ostendi*, in quæstione de habitibus infusis, de canonicâ auctoritate aliquorum librorum sacræ Scripturæ, de carentiâ omnis peccati venialis in ipsâmet Virgine. Addi etiam potest exemplum de resurrectione ejus, de gloriosâ assumptione, et de sanctitate nativitatis ejus: ex his enim aliqua jam sunt de fide, alia verò sunt fidei proxima, *et nullus dubitat quin tandem possint definiri*. Ad hanc definitionem satis est, ut aliqua supernaturalis veritas in traditione vel Scripturâ *implicitè* contenta sit, ut crescente communi consensu Ecclesiæ, per quam sæpe Spiritus Sanctus traditiones explicat vel Scripturam declarat, tandem possit Ecclesia definitionem suam adhibere, *quæ vim habet cujusdam revelationis respectu nostri*, propter infallibilem Spiritûs Sancti assistentiam." (sec. vi.)

Petavius, no mean judge, assures us that all the Fathers were ignorant of, not to say denied, this doctrine. Shall we give up that hope, so sweet to Catholic minds, that the Church may at some future period formally declare it of faith? or shall we allow that articles may be of faith, of which only the germ can be traced to Apostolic times? At least, we see which of the two alternatives these great Doctors would take; and we have Suarez's judgment also, that the Church has *already* acted on this principle, in her declaration of the B. Virgin's freedom from venial sin, and on other subjects he mentions: a fact, indeed, of which there can be no doubt.

Now, on the other proposed question, viz., whether *logical* inferences from tradition may possibly make part of the Christian Faith. Bellarmine says, "De verbo Dei

non scripto," (chap. ix.) "Nihil est de fide, nisi quod Deus per Apostolos aut Prophetas revelavit, aut *quod evidenter inde deducitur*. Non enim novis revelationibus nunc regitur Ecclesia," &c. In another work he allows much greater latitude, (De Purgatorio i. 15.) "*Dogmata fidei* quatuor modis probari solent. Primò ex testimonio expresso Scripturæ, cum Ecclesiæ declaratione.....Secundò *per evidentem deductionem* ex iis quæ habenter expressè in Scriptura.....Tertio, ex verbo Dei tradito.....Quartò *per evidentem deductionem* ex verbo Dei tradito.....Sufficiencia horum quatuor mediorum inde patet, quia id solum est de fide quod est à Deo revelatum mediatè vel immediatè.....conciliorum decreta, &c., tunc solùm faciunt rem de fide, cùm explicant verbum Dei, *aut inde aliquid deducunt*." Where, over and above the office of *keeping* the traditions, he allows to the Church that of interpreting Scripture and deducing from Scripture pro re natâ; giving as his example the 1st and 6th General Councils respectively: not to mention, what he had allowed in the first quoted extract, deductions from tradition. It is difficult to imagine how any one can claim for the Church a larger field wherein to exercise her infallible judgment than this.

Vasquez again, when directly treating "de locis theologicis," (vol. i. disputation xii.) proceeds, "ex his omnibus locis (Scripture, Apostolical Tradition, Authority of the Catholic Church, of Councils, and of the Pope) et Patrum auctoritate eodem modo accepta possumus argumentari ad deducendas novas conclusiones.....aut evidenti illatione aut probabili: priori modo deducitur conclusio mere Theologica, et talis consequentia, sive utraque propositio ex prædictis locis assumpta sit, sive altera præmissarum evidens sit naturali ratione, *sufficit ad definiendam in concilio conclusionem de fide*."

But this subject has been very copiously handled by another writer, who enjoys considerable reputation as a theologian, and has moreover especial claim on our deference as having been one of the Bishops who assisted at the Holy Council of Trent. We allude to Melchior Canus, and his well-known work, "De Locis Theologicis." The whole of that work is in fact one continued illustration of the principle with which we are engaged, but we shall confine ourselves to a few more striking extracts: and we shall begin with the following, as fitted at once to impress

on our readers the fact, how inconsistent is Canus's teaching with that principle of what we may be allowed to call *stationariness*, which Mr. Brownson advocates.

"Si vel Ecclesia, vel Concilium, vel Sedes Apostolica, *vel etiam Sancti*, unâ mente eâdemque voce aliquam Theologiæ conclusionem et confecerint et fidelibus etiam præscripserint; hæc veritas Catholica ita censebitur, ut si esset per se à Christo revelata; et illi qui adversetur æquè erit *hæreticus*, ac si sacris literis traditionibusve Apostolicis refragaretur." (lib. 12mus. cap. 6.)

"Sed et id postremò considerandum (*est enim res magna, ac diligenti contemplatione dignissima*) non illud modò ad doctrinam Catholicam pertinere quod Apostolis expressè revelatum est, verùm hoc etiam, quod ex alterâ propositione revelatâ et alterâ certâ in lumine naturali, syllogismo collectioneque evidenti conficitur, ut, Christum Dominum *habere duas voluntates duosque intellectus*," &c. (lib. 6mus. cap. viii.)

The same example he also appends to the former of the two quotations: in both then he expressly asserts, that the Monothelite heresy, anathematized in the Sixth Ecumenical Council, is not *directly* contrary to Apostolical Tradition, but only contrary to the *intellectual conclusions* drawn from that Tradition. It is almost needless to add, that the number of these conclusions must necessarily be ever increasing. In the following passage Canus expresses his general principle.

"Nec si conciliorum et Apostolicæ Sedis auctoritas fidem certam facit Catholici dogmatis, aut Sanctorum etiam omnium consensus et conspiratio una, [which his argument throughout maintains] idcirco aut principia Theologiæ cumulamur aut ejus formalem rationem extendimus. Quoniam, ut sæpe alias diximus, nec Concilium, nec Sedis Apostolicæ Pontifex, nec Sancti Scripturarum, interpretes novas fidelibus revelationes edunt, sed quas ab Apostolis accepit Ecclesia aut posteris integras et illibatas tradunt, aut illas exprimunt et interpretantur, aut certè consequentia et annexa colligant, adversa et repugnantia manifestant." (lib. 12mus. cap. iii.)

Canus, therefore, attributes to the Church two other functions in regard to the Apostolic Traditions, besides that one of keeping them pure and undefiled: and he immediately proceeds to make this clearer. In order to explain what follows, we should premise that he has enumerated *ten* "*loci theologici ex quibus Theologi omnes suas argumentationes inveniunt.*" (Lib. 1mus, cap. iii.)

viz., (1.) Scripture, (2.) Apostolical Tradition, (3.) the Authority of the Church, (4.) of Councils, (5.) of the Holy See, (6.) of the Holy Fathers, (7.) of the Schoolmen, (8.) Natural Reason, (9.) Authority of Philosophers, and (10.) of Human History. The passage in hand then proceeds as follows,—

“*Principiorum itaque Theologiæ numerus è libris sanctis atque Apostolorum traditionibus integerrimè constituitur. Quamobrem duobus primis locis [i. e. in Scripture and Tradition] contenta sunt omnia quæ in initiis Theologiæ veris et germanis numeranda sunt. Sed his initiis, tanquam seminibus ab Ecclesia datis, quæ Christus Apostolis, Apostoli Ecclesiæ dederunt, pastores et doctores ac theologi in universum omnes ea rigant et excolunt, et quæ plantæ traduces propagines ex eis oriuntur, proferunt et ostendunt. Illa fundamenta sunt theologiæ ecclesiasticæque doctrinæ, quæ Christus per Apostolos posuit; cæteri sive Concilii Patres, sive Pontifices summi, seu Ecclesiæ doctores sancti, omnino superædificant.*”

Councils, Popes, and Doctors then, in this writer's judgment, *build upon* the foundation of Apostolic Tradition, in their teaching, not merely fence and protect it; while he started with declaring that their decrees “*fidem certam faciunt Catholici dogmatis.*” In like manner, a little further on,—

“*Cardinalis Turrecremata septem gradus ordine ponit propositionum Catholicarum, quæ eadem, cum in disputandi controversiam disceptationemque vocantur, quæstiones fidei dicuntur. Primus earum est quæ in libris sacris habentur expressæ. Secundus earum quæ ex hisce per certam et necessariam consecutionem fiunt. Tertius earum quas verbo tenus Christus Apostolis, Apostoli Ecclesiæ, tradiderunt. Quartus earum quæ in Conciliis Universalibus definitæ sunt. Quintus earum quæ à Sede Apostolicâ sunt fidelibus ad credendum propositæ. Sextus illarum quæ de fide et refutatione heresum Sancti Doctores unâ mente unâque voce docuerunt. Septimus illarum est, quæ ex tertio quarto quinto et sexto generibus consecutione firmâ et necessariâ derivantur. Ex quibus capite sequenti distinguit etiam septem genera hæreticarum propositionum quæ septem illis generibus propositionum fidei repugnant.*” (lib. 12mus. cap. vi.)

Where it is hardly necessary to point out that *explicit* Apostolical Tradition constitute one only out of the seven classes of Catholic propositions.

“*Nobis tamen,*” continues Canus, “*ad breviorum numerum...redigenda sunt omnia. Cum igitur veritas fidei, ut paullò ante*

diximus, bipartita sit, et hæc ad fidem mediate, illa immediate, pertineat, necesse est, duos gradus propositionum fidei generales statim à principio collocare. Prior earum erit quæ Theologiæ legitima principia sunt.....hoc est ea omnia quæ Deus *in se ipsis* Ecclesiæ revelavit: posterior vero gradus harum erit quæ *ex prioribus illis necessario colliguntur*.....Sed quoniam Scripturæ Sacræ nativa et germana sensa obscura interdum et implicata sunt, nec semper exploratum est et cognitum quænam illa sint quæ sinè scripto Apostoli memoriæ prodiderunt, *sæpe etiam impeditum est et quasi tenebris circumfusum an conclusio controversa necessario è rebus fidei ducatur*, id nos modò expedire atque explanare cupimus, quibus notis et signis cognosci et distingui possit veritas fidei."

From this passage we draw an important conclusion; viz., that the "certain and necessary inferences" from revealed principles, of which Canus so often speaks, are by no means merely simple and obvious deductions, but on the contrary, "*often*" of so subtle a character, that "it is an involved and obscure question," whether they are really consequences or not. And in order to supply his readers with the means of deciding on these two questions, viz., what are really Apostolical Traditions, and what are really legitimate deductions from them, he proceeds to lay down various rules. One of these rules is expressed in the passage with which we commenced our quotations; in which he says, that if the Church, or a Council, or the Apostolic See, or the Saints, (by this word, all through, he means the Fathers,) with one voice, shall have formed some theological conclusion, and proposed it to the faithful, whoever contradicts it will be as much a heretic, as if he opposed the Sacred Writings or the Apostolic Traditions. It is impossible, surely, for words to be more explicit.

Once more:—all Christian truth comes to the world ultimately from Christ and His Apostles; and yet not in such a sense, as that Popes and Councils, in forming their decrees, have no other labour than that of formally proposing what the great body of Christians already knew: which is Mr. Brownson's theory.

"Omnem ergo fidei veritatem vel à Christo dum in vitâ degeret vel à Spiritu Sancto Apostoli postea acceperunt, eamque juxta præscriptam legem aut scripto aut verbo Ecclesiæ tradiderunt..... Itaque post Apostolos et eos qui ab Apostolis probati sunt, *nullos auctores sacros expectamus*. Sed sive summus Pontifex, seu concilia, primùm *de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum* judicant.

.....Id ante omnia Conciliis tribuamus. Deinde et illud, quòd veras et legitimas Christi et Apostolorum traditiones viâ et ratione investigant. Rursus *quenam conclusiones his cohaereant*, quæ contra dissideant, certâ complexione et annexione conficiunt. Consulunt autem in hujusmodi rebus *finiendis* [i. e. in *defining*] non sacras literas modò, verùm etiam Apostolorum instituta, priora Concilia, summorum Pontificum decreta, Sanctorum Veterum scripta, *Scholasticorum Theologorum dogmata, rectam philosophiæ rationem*. Breviter causam de quâ disserunt in eos locos conjiciunt de quibus liber hic noster instituitur. Nec enim ex aliis fontibus argumenta derivare possunt ad Fidei Theologiæque solvendas questiones. Novas autem revelationes et Scripturas Sacras quærere, Judæorum est, qui recentes etiamnum Prophetas præstolantur." (lib. 5. cap. v.)

The fact of the author having himself taken part in the Council of Trent, (to which he himself alludes in his work,) gives, of course an especial weight to his judgment on points such as these.

And by way of further showing the progress which has been made by time in theological certainty, we may quote his enumeration of the errors into which various of the Holy Fathers have fallen: remembering that his admissions on this head are of the more weight, because it was the very object of his seventh book, in which the quotation occurs, to place the authority of the Fathers at the highest possible point.

"Sanctus is fuit qui credidit ab hæreticis baptizatos esse rebaptizandos. Sanctus fuit, qui in Christi corpore et sensum pœnæ et dolorem fuisse negavit. Sanctus fuit, qui in Chiliastarum dogma descendit. Sanctus fuit, qui viro ob adulterii causam uxorem repudiandi alterum matrimonium concessit. Sanctus fuit, qui animis piorum usque ad judicii diem veram felicitatem ademit. Sanctus fuit, qui animam hominis ex traduce esse putavit. Sanctus fuit, qui animam Adæ ante corpus fuisse editam opinatus est. Sancti fuere, qui angelos multis ante mundum corporeum æternitibus creatos esse existimârunt. Atque horum opuscula a Gelasio comprobata sunt. Hos ego tamen reverentiæ causâ propriis nominibus non appello: malo enim Antiquitati Sanctitatisque parcere quàm otioso lectori facere satis." (lib. 7mus. cap. iii.)

And he mentions just before, as one reason for their mistakes, "Quoniam res nonnullæ non erant tunc adedò in Ecclesiâ definitæ, ut nunc esse videmus."

So much specially on these two *kinds* of "development;" but Suarez enters professedly on the whole subject, and examines the question, "an materia fidei creve-

rit:" an especially valuable fact, since there is no one theologian of later times that can be named, who is considered to carry more weight with him in his decisions, so eminent were his intellectual powers, so profound his learning, and so great his holiness of life. Benedict XIV. calls him "Doctor Eximius;" and Bossuet says, "Suarez, en qui comme l'on sait, on entend toute l'école moderne."* The discussion to which we allude is contained in the 6th section of the 2nd disputation, in his work "De Fide;" the title of the section is, "Utrum materia fidei successu temporum creverit, vel interdum minuta fuerit." At starting he lays down the distinction between explicit and implicit faith, and says the question can only concern the former; which is evident enough from the very wide sense he assigns to the phrase, "implicit belief."† The earlier part of the section relates wholly to the times before Christ; and is not to our purpose: we may mention however that he considers the mysteries even of the Trinity and Incarnation, "in their substance," (quoad substantiam,) to have been explicitly believed by the rulers of the Jewish Church, though not by the multitude. He then comes, as he says, to the proposed question, and states two opposite opinions. First, he considers a rule thrown out by St. Thomas, that those who lived nearest the time of Christ, whether before or afterwards, had more explicit or more perfect faith than others: by which St. Thomas, he says, seems to have meant only that some men of that time exceeded all others in this respect. Even so understood, however, he says, the view is not without difficulty; for (1) Adam had more explicit faith and greater wisdom than St. John Baptist, and it is questionable at least, whether the same may not be said of Abraham, Moses, David, and such men: and (2) because after the coming of Christ, *many propositions have been defined of faith, which before were not of faith*; as that Christ had two wills, that the Blessed Virgin never com-

* Bergier's Theological Dictionary, vol. iv. p. 758.

† "Credere implicitè," he says, "est credere in alio tantum; quia quod sic creditur reverà non cognoscitur, neque intellectus format proprium conceptum propositionis quæ implicitè tantum credi dicitur sed alterius in quâ illa continetur." This includes, not only what we have called implicit belief, but even rather what we have called potential and seminal.

mitted venial sin, that Justification is by an inherent quality, and the like: therefore it would appear that faith is more explicit in the Church now, than it was in the primitive ages, even in the Apostolic; for to be more explicit, is nothing else than to be extended to more objects of belief (ad plura credibilia.) Moved by this difficulty, he considers an opposite rule, expressed by St. Gregory the Great in these words, "quantò mundus ad extremum ducitur, tantò nobis æternæ scientiæ aditus largiùs aperitur." But this rule, Suarez says, is also not without its difficulty; more especially this difficulty, that it supposes the later doctors of the church to have had more explicit faith than the Apostles; which is commonly reprobated by theologians as even a rash sentiment. (It is well known that *temerarium* is almost the severest epithet that can be applied to a proposition, short of "hæreticum.") This notwithstanding however, he says, these two rules are both true, if suitably explained, and may easily be harmonized. It is not necessary here to cite this interesting discussion; the following paragraph will show his judgment on our present question.

"Una tantum superest expedienda difficultas, quæ proposita etiam est, et est majoris momenti; an scilicet in Ecclesiâ Christi creverit fides, quoad aliquas propositiones *credendas de fide in posteriori tempore*, quæ antea non credebantur tanquam de fide? nam ex dictis videtur sequi pars negativa, quia sapientia infusa non potuit etiam extensive crescere in hac Ecclesia, alias possent posteriores pastores Ecclesiæ in hac sapientia superare Apostolos: item in hac Ecclesia non sunt novæ revelationes; ergo nec nova credibilia. Denique ita videntur sentire Scholastici supra citati, dicentes non augeri fidem Ecclesiæ quoad numerum credibilium, sed solum quoad explicationem; D. Thom. etiam in hac quæst. dicit, nihil doceri ab Ecclesia, quod in doctrina Apostolorum non contineatur, sed explicari magis, et proponi fidelibus propter hereticos: unde etiam Wald: dicit non posse ecclesiam novum articulum Fidei condere, sed antiquos explicare, quod etiam tradit Castro et Cano. Sed quia hoc punctum attingit materiam de Potestate Pontificis et Concilii ad definiendas Fidei Veritates, quam infra disp. 5. sect. 7 et 8 ex professo tractaturi sumus, ideo breviter dico, simpliciter quidem asserendum esse, Ecclesiam *non tradere novam fidem, sed antiquam semper stabilire, et explicare*: nam propterea recurrit semper ad Scripturam et Apostolicas traditiones; et ita docent etiam antiqui Patres, ut Vincent. Lirinensis lib. cont. Profan. voc. novit. cap. 7. &c. Ireneus contra hæres. et Hieronym in id Psalm 'Dominus narrabit in Scripturis populorum, et principum horum, qui fuerunt

in ea' ubi expendit verbum illud, Fuerunt, ut exponat Principes illos fuisse Apostolos. Hoc tamen non obstante, verum est *aliquam propositionem explicitè nunc credi de Fide, quæ antea explicitè non credebatur ab Ecclesia, quamvis implicitè in Doctrina Antiqua contineretur*: hoc probant *exempla supra adlucta*, et optimum etiam est de baptismo dato ab hæretico in forma Ecclesiæ, an sit iterandus, vel sit validus? nam tempore Cypriani neutrum erat de Fide, et ideo licet ipse, et Stephanus Papa contraria sentirent, nihilo minus in ejusdem Fidei unione permanserunt; quia Stephanus nihil definivit, Postea vero de Fide traditum est, talem baptismum non esse iterandum: et *nulla similia* possunt afferri, et *sine dubio hoc spectat ad potestatem definiendi Ecclesiæ*. Neque ad hoc est necessaria nova revelatio, sed sufficit *infallibilis assistentia Spiritus Sancti ad explicandum et proponendum explicitè id, quod antea implicitè tantum in revelatis continebatur*. Et ita sunt explicandi Auctores. Nam illa Explicatio, quam dicunt posse Ecclesiam facere, *aliquando est per explicationem novæ propositionis contentæ in antiquis*. Illa autem propositio nunquam est novus articulus, [i. e. apparently a new article of the Apostles' Creed.] quia non pertinet ad materiam veluti substantialem Fidei explicitè ab omnibus credendam; illa enim sufficienter fuit semper explicata in Symbolo; sed pertinet sæpe ad Doctrinam Fidei, quam oportet sciri a Doctoribus Ecclesiæ juxta temporum varietatem, vel necessitatem.—Denique propter id, quod de Apostolis tangitur, possumus distinguere duplicem ordinem propositionum, quæ *successu temporum explicitè creduntur*: quædam enim pertinent veluti ad substantiam mysteriorum; ut in mysterio Incarnationis, *quod Christus habuerit duas voluntates*, et in mysterio Eucharistiæ, *quod substantia panis post consecrationem non maneat*, et similes: et de hujusmodi credendum est fuisse cognitæ ab Apostolis non tantum implicitè, sed explicitè, quia optimè intelligebant Scripturas, et Mystera omnia, quæ ad traditionem Fidei pertinebant. Aliæ vero sunt propositiones contingentes, quæ tempore Apostolorum nondum evenerant; ut quod iste sit Pontifex, quod hoc sit verum Concilium, et similes; et has non oportuit cognosci ab Apostolis, explicitè, sed tantum in universali, quia non erat necessarium illis revelari omnia futura. Et fortasse hoc modo in die Pentecostes non fuerunt edocti explicitè de omnibus misteriis Fidei, quoad particulares circumstantias eorum, ut de modo vocationis Gentium, et de cessatione legalium, ut plane colligitur ex Actorum 10 et 15. et sic etiam Joannes in Apocalypsi multa intellexit de futuris, quæ aliis revelata non fuere, et fortasse multa ex illis non intelligentur certo et explicitè donec impleantur. Ita ergo potest Ecclesia in his rebus cognoscendis *proficere, etiam cum certitudine Fidei, interveniente Ecclesiæ definitione, quæ propter assistentiam Spiritus Sancti vim habet revelationis, seu infallibiliter applicat revelationem universalem ad particulare objectum.*"

To this express testimony, on the general subject under

discussion, we may add the sentiments of Möhler and Döllinger; the latter a living theologian, the former not long dead. Thus Möhler:—

“One doctrine of faith hath subsisted, and must subsist through the whole history of the Church. We will not and cannot believe otherwise than as our fathers have believed; but as to their peculiarities of opinion, we may adopt them or not as we please. Besides, the truth which we possess in common with them has, by means of the splendid intellects which devoted their undivided energy to its defence, been often more deeply investigated, or contemplated in all its bearings, and viewed in a more general connexion; so that Christian science makes continual progress, and the mysteries of God are ever more clearly unfolded.” And he adds in a note,—

“This explanation of St. Vincent’s was occasioned by the Manicheans, who brought up the old Gnostic charge against Catholics, that they were under a religious tyranny, that among them was found no independent enquiry into doctrine, and no progress in knowledge. How desirable it were, that we could every where find such clear notions of the progressive development of Christian dogmas, as are here advanced by Vincentius.”—*Symbolism*, vol. 1. pp. 66, 67. (Robertson’s translation.)

And Döllinger, on one particular subject.

“But we must confess that the power of the Roman Pontiff and his relation to the Universal Church, were not yet fully developed. Like all other essential parts of the constitution of the Church, the supremacy was known and acknowledged from the beginning as a divine institution, but it required time to unfold its faculties; it assumed by degrees the determined form in which the bishop of Rome exercised systematically the authority entrusted to him for the preservation of the internal and external unity of the Church.”—Döllinger vol. i. p. 263. Dr. Cox’s translation.

And De Maistre’s judgment has been quoted in our article on Mr. Allies’s book. To that very remarkable passage we beg the reader’s especial attention.

It is impossible to read attentively the history of any one among the great controversies which have agitated the Church, without seeing the principle we have stated distinctly at work. St. Augustine’s judgment, when speaking generally on the subject, is well known. One particular instance however happens to be before our eyes at this minute, being contained in Mr. Allies’s work; and we will therefore proceed to quote it. It is upon the subject of the controversy between St. Stephen and St. Cyprian on Baptism; nor let it be forgotten, in reading St.

Augustine's sentiments, that *now* every Catholic is required, under pain of anathema, to receive the doctrine declared by St. Stephen. In the first quotation, St. Augustine is quoting St. Cyprian's words and commenting on them. The translation is Mr. Allies's.

“‘It remains for us each to deliver our sentiments on this matter, judging no one, nor removing any one, if he be of a different opinion, from the right of communion.’* There he not only permits me without loss of communion further to seek the truth, but even to be of a different judgment. ‘For no one of us,’ saith he, ‘sets himself up to be a Bishop of Bishops, or by fear of his tyranny compels his colleagues to the necessity of obedience.’ What can be more gentle? What more humble? Certainly no authority deters us from seeking what is the truth: ‘since,’ he says, ‘every Bishop according to his recognised liberty and power possesses a free choice, and can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another:’ certainly, I imagine, *in those questions which have not yet been thoroughly and completely settled.* For he knew how great and mysterious a Sacrament the whole Church was then *with various reasonings considering,* and he left open a freedom of inquiry, *that the truth might by search be laid open.*”—p. 36.

“You are wont to object against us Cyprian's letters, Cyprian's judgment, Cyprian's Council: why do you assume the authority of Cyprian for your schism, and reject his example for the peace of the Church? But who is ignorant that canonical holy Scripture, as well of the Old as of the New Testament, is contained in its own certain limits, and is so preferred to all subsequent letters of Bishops, that no doubt or discussion at all can be held concerning it, as to whether that be true or right, which is acknowledged to be found written in it: but that the letters of Bishops which either have been or are written after the confirmation of the canon, may be reprehended both by the reasoning, peradventure more full of wisdom, of some one in that matter more skilled, and by the weightier authority and more learned judgment of other Bishops, and by Councils, if haply there has been in them any deviation from the truth; and that Councils themselves, holden in particular regions or provinces, yield, beyond all question, to the authority of plenary Councils, which are made out of the whole Christian world: and that former plenary Councils themselves are often corrected by subsequent ones, when *by some practical experience what has been hidden is laid open, and what lay concealed is recognised,* without any puffing up of sacrilegious pride, without any haughty exhibition of arrogance, without any strife of livid envy, with holy humility, with Catholic peace, with Christian charity.”†—pp. 41, 42.

* Tom. ix. p. 110.

† Tom. ix. 97. G.

"Nor should we ourselves venture to make any such assertion, were we not supported by the unanimous authority of the whole Church : *to which he too, without doubt, would yield, if the truth of this question had at that period been thoroughly sifted, and declared, and established by a plenary Council.* For if he praises and extols Peter for having with patience and harmony suffered correction from a single younger colleague, how much more readily would he himself, with the Council of his province, have yielded to the authority of the whole world, *when the truth was laid open?* because, indeed, so holy and so peaceful a soul might most readily agree to one person (i. e. the Pope,) speaking and proving the truth; and this, perhaps, was really the fact, but we know not. For not all which at that time was transacted between Bishops could be committed to posterity and writing, nor do we know all which was so committed. For how could that matter, involved in so many clouds of altercations, be brought to the clear consideration and ratification of a plenary Council, *unless first for a long time throughout all the regions of the world it had been thoroughly tried, and made manifest by many discussions and conferences of Bishops on the one side and on the other?* But wholesome peace produces this, that *when obscure questions have been long under inquiry, and, through the difficulty of ascertaining them, beget various judgments in brotherly discussion, until the pure truth be arrived at, the bond of unity holds, lest in the part cut off, the incurable wound of error should remain.*"—pp. 43, 44.

Nor should we omit a few extracts from the well known passage of S. Vincentius Lirinensis, which Mr. Brownson has had the candour to quote. This author, it need hardly be said, would be the very last to sanction any principle which would really lead to *innovation* on doctrinal matters.

"Peradventure some one will say, shall we then have no *advance* of religion in the Church of Christ? Surely, let us have *the greatest that may be.* For who is either so envious of men or hateful of God which would labour to hinder that? But yet in such sort that it may be truly an *increase of faith* (profectus fidei) not a change.....Fitting it is that the understanding, knowledge, and wisdom.....of the whole Church should by advance of ages abundantly increase and go forward.....Let the religion of our souls imitate the nature of our bodies, which, although with process of time they develope and unfold their proportions, yet they remain the same that they were.....Christian doctrine must follow these laws of increasing, to wit, that with years it wax more sound, with time it become more ample. Our forefathers, in this field of the Church, sowed the wheat seed of true faith.....It is reason and very consistent that.....we should of *the increase of wheaten teaching*

reap the fruit of wheaten doctrine; so that, when with tract of time *any of those first seeds begin to bud and come forth.....* yet there be no change of the propriety of the germ."

We desiderate Mr. Brownson's usual fairness and common sense in his remark on this passage: "The gain," he says, (p. 73,) (in reference to the increased apprehension of doctrine recognised by St. Vincent,) "is in a clearer understanding, not of what it *is*, but of what it *is not*:" and more than once afterwards he has a similar remark. Can he gravely maintain, that the increase of body which human beings obtain in their progress from infancy to maturity, (and this is one of St. Vincent's comparisons,) is fairly paralleled by such an infinitesimal wonderful advance of knowledge as from the explicit belief e. g. that our Blessed Lord has two wills, to the further belief that it is false to say He had only one will? A progress from one proposition to another precisely equipollent with it, a simple performance of the process recognised in logic as *conversion by negation*, this is the *whole* progress in doctrine which Mr. Brownson admits; and with this he fancies he can satisfy such a passage as we have just quoted.

Indeed, our doctrine is implied of necessity in the language so universally held by Catholics, as to the essential importance of the attribute of infallibility; without which, we always say, there would be a series of endless and hopeless controversies. For how would this be the case, if the Church always held explicitly and consciously the contradictory to a heresy, before that heresy sprang up? What need is there of infallibility for declaring that Rome is in Italy? If Christians then believed the doctrine, e. g., that our Blessed Lord had two wills, as distinctly as they believed the geographical fact just mentioned, what more need of an infallible authority to declare the latter than to declare the former? In fact it has before now happened that Catholic writers have gone even beyond due bounds in their statement of this principle. Thus Medina, a Spanish Franciscan, is quoted (and censured) by Bellarmine, (*De Clericis*, i. 15,) as charging St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, Sedulius, Primasius, St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Ecumenius, and Theophylact, with holding the Arian heresy. "These men," he says, "were otherwise most holy and most thoroughly acquainted with the Holy Scriptures:" and "from respect

to Jerome and these Greek Fathers, this opinion was in their case hushed up or tolerated; but in case of heretics, who in many other points also dissented from the Church, it has always been condemned as heretical." In the same connection we may quote four other passages from Catholic writers, which go very far beyond any thing we have here maintained. They were cited in one of the "Tracts for the Times," (No. 79, p. 50-52.) and may be considered as genuine, from the fact that, although appearing in so well known a publication, their genuineness has not been denied. The last quotation, indeed, the writer makes on his own responsibility, which is a still farther guarantee; the three former are on the authority of Jeremy Taylor the Anglican controversialist.

Cardinal Fisher, than whom there can hardly be a more revered name, says, "Whoever reads the commentaries of the ancient Greeks, will find no mention, as far as I see, or the slightest possible, concerning purgatory. Nay, even the Latins *did not all at once but only gradually* enter into the truth of this matter. *For awhile it was unknown, at a later date it was known* to the Church Universal." And with reference to this and the kindred subject of Indulgences, "*We are all aware* that by means of the acumen of later times, many things, both from the Gospels and the other Scriptures, are now more clearly developed and more exactly understood than they once were." *Polydore Virgil* appeals to the above statement, and adds, "Moreover by the Greeks, even to this day, the doctrine is not believed." *Alphonsus de Castro* says, "Concerning Purgatory, there is scarcely any mention, especially among the Greek writers; for which reason even to this day it is not believed by the Greeks."

The quotation made by the Tract-writer on his own authority, is from the preface of the Benedictine Edition of St. Ambrose's Works, to that Saint's Treatise, "*De bono mortis.*"

"What might seem almost incredible, is the uncertainty and inconsistency of the Holy Fathers on this subject, (Purgatory,) from the very times of the Apostles down to the Council of Florence.....For not only do they differ, one from the other, *as commonly happens in such questions not yet defined by the Church*, but they are not even consistent with themselves."

We need hardly say that we are far from acquiescing in

this statement; only it shows how recognised in the Church has been this principle of "development," that a Catholic writer could possibly have made it. It need therefore the less excite wonder, if the opposite principle, the principle (if one may so speak) of *stationariness* in doctrine, may have also occasionally been so stated as to obscure the other side of the picture; to throw discredit, in appearance, on the office ever performed by the Church, as in handing down Doctrine, so also in defining, illustrating and expanding it. Catholic controversialists have felt, and most truly, that there cannot be a greater contrast in the world than between the Protestant's rule of faith and the Catholic's; and they have at times expressed this contrast in the strongest and broadest manner. The true Catholic shuns, as among the greatest of sins, the bringing in his own judgment to sift or criticise the teaching of the Church. He but endeavours humbly to learn, heartily to appropriate, zealously to defend, the Doctrine he has received; and if this Doctrine expand both in his intellect and in his spiritual nature, this is from no profane desire of novelty or restless love of change, but because it is the necessary law of human nature that so the case shall be. He looks for no new doctrine, being heartily contented with, and deeply submissive to, that which he has received. He desires ever to keep his intellect in full subjection to his spiritual nature; and his one absorbing interest here on earth is to save his own soul.

We cannot here examine Mr. Brownson's arguments, for the simple reason that time and space will not permit. Whatever comes from him of course deserves careful attention, and if called upon we are prepared fully to meet his reasoning. Of *testimonies*, we can only find *three* in any definite shape: the statement of a condemned proposition; a passage from St. Thomas; and a long quotation from Bossuet; though there is in one place, we think, a merely passing allusion to Father Perrone.

Now as to the first of these three, we greatly desiderate a *reference*: for every one knows it is impossible to determine the sense in which a proposition is condemned, unless at all events by seeing it in its place among the condemned series; not to mention, in addition, some knowledge of the history of the condemnation. There is no difficulty however here in answering Mr. Brownson. He tells us "it is a condemned proposition" "that morals

can be better learned from the moderns than from the ancients." If by this Mr. Brownson understands, that the Modern Church is a more sure and trustworthy guide in morals, and has preserved the purity of moral principles with greater fidelity, than the Ancient, no one would join more cordially than ourselves in anathematising any such proposition. But if he understands by it that the details of moral theology were more distinctly known, and its principles more variously and completely carried out, by St. Alphonsus than by St. Polycarp or St. Ignatius Martyr, surely there is no Catholic living who could doubt the fact: it cannot possibly be in any such sense, that the Church condemned the proposition cited.

The passage from St. Thomas, it will have been seen, is quoted also by Suarez in the passage above cited; and *he* considers it must be understood in that very sense, to which Mr. Brownson regards it as contradictory.

As to Bossuet, however brilliant his endowments and however devout his life, there is more than one circumstance which makes his testimony to such a point of doctrine as this rather suspicious. First, the part itself he took in promoting that great spiritual rebellion, which goes by the name of the Gallican Liberties; of which more in another place. Secondly; it was especially to his purpose in that controversy, to say as much as possible on the duty of preserving what *we* should call a merely external and hollow similarity with earlier times; and the admission of any such doctrine as De Maistre's on the development of the Papal power, would have been fatal to his position. Thirdly, on the very subject on which Mr. Brownson quotes him, not only is he at issue with the profoundly learned Petavius, but actually joined the French clergy in an address of thanks to Bull, an Anglican schismatic, for his services to the Church in *answering* that great Catholic Doctor. Mr. Brownson will be the first man living to feel the force of this last consideration.

In bringing our argument to a close, two further observations will be necessary. First, although we have stated at the outset what appears to us the real principle on which the growth in Christian Doctrine has proceeded, we would not have Mr. Brownson, or any one else, imagine that the real question can be affected, by any exception which may be taken to that statement. Nothing is more trans-

parent in Mr. Brownson's writings than his hearty love and desire of truth: he will be very ready then to see, that the real phenomenon to which he should apply his mind, are the express declarations of the great writers whom we have called into court. Whatever be the true *theory* on the facts of the case, these facts equally remain; viz., that Petavius, Suarez, Vasquez, Melchior Canus, (to mention no others,) with one voice deny the proposition, which Mr. Brownson maintains as *undeniable*. They deny the proposition, that all doctrines formally decreed by the Church, must of necessity have been *explicitly* handed down from the Apostles; and maintain, on the contrary, that it suffices if they are *implicitly*, or *potentially*, or *seminally*,* contained in what was so handed down: of which latter fact they regard the Church as an infallible judge.

The second observation is implied in the very circumstance, that we have been led to state *our own view* of the principle on which this growth has proceeded; viz., that no distinct and systematic theory has been drawn upon the subject by those writers themselves. Canus indeed may be considered partly as an exception to this remark; but not altogether so. In fact, it is only in accordance with, only an instance of, the very principle for which we have been contending, that the doctrine of development should be developed; that a principle on which the Church has ever proceeded, and which her greatest Doctors have from time to time recognized and fully allowed, should at last, by the progress of controversy, have to be drawn forth into a consistent and systematic theory.

But there is also another reason for this circumstance: viz., the surprising advances which the science of *criticism* has made in modern times; whereby the genuine works of ancient writers have been discerned from the spurious. It is not too much to say that it is only quite of late that the *facts* have been sufficiently ascertained, on which such a theory must be erected.

It is sometimes implied as an objection to the principle which we have been defending, that its recognition would

* "*Seminibus*," we have seen, is Canus's own word for expressing the relation between the explicit Apostolic teaching and later judgments of the Church.

tend to impair the evidence for the Divine Authority of Catholic Doctrine. But in arguing with Catholics, it is surely unnecessary to say more, than that the question is not one of probable *results*, but of truth or falsehood. Catholics are charged indeed by Protestants, as the first Christians were by heathens, with deliberately "doing evil that there may come good;" but the Catholic of the present day joins with St. Paul in his indignant repudiation of any such maxim. We must not then mis-state facts to serve a controversial purpose; and the question therefore merely recurs, on which side is the *true* statement of facts.

In truth, however, we are most fully confident that no such effect would result as is here supposed. The historical argument in favour of the Church, is wholly independent of any view that may be entertained as to the growth of doctrine within her pale. In our article on Mr. Allies's work, we have been led to state the nature of this historical argument, and to that we may refer our readers. We may also refer them to the admirable work of Klee's on the Church, just translated by the excellent President of St. Edmund's College, where this argument is more unanswerably and convincingly handled than in any other we have seen. And any one may observe that its reasoning would be wholly unaffected by an admission of this principle of "development," to its fullest extent. Indeed, any argument which goes upon an examination of patristic statements of doctrine, from its very nature is accessible to none but a most limited class of readers; and as to its effect *on* that class, *that* depends on the question whether it be so handled as to accord with the facts of the case. And thus we return to our old point, that the only question is which view of doctrine *does* so accord.

We have been arguing all through as to a Catholic audience: and yet one principal object of our remarks has been a reply to recent objections from other quarters. It has been in many cases either said or implied, that this doctrine of "development" is a novelty, to which Catholics have been driven by the stress of Anglican arguments; and that there is a marked inconsistency between recent statements on the subject and the whole past tenor of Catholic theology. We trust these objectors will now see their error; and will see that their opinions have had no other effect, than the effect which heretical opinions ever

have had: viz., to bring forth into clearer light some acknowledged Catholic principle, and afford increased harmony and consolidation to the fabric of Catholic Doctrine.

ART. IV.—1. *Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten*. VON BERTHOLD AUERBACH. Dritte Auflage. 2 Theilen, 8vo. Marnnheim: 1846.

2.—*Village Tales from the Black Forest*. By BERTHOLD AUERBACH. Translated from the German by META TAYLOR. With four Illustrations by John Absolon. London, David Bogue: 1847.

IT would not be easy to find a more striking title, or one more likely to attract the lovers of romance; though we doubt whether it be not one by which the majority of readers will be misled. We are old enough to remember the time when it could have had but one import—when the very name, “German Tale,” was a recognized synonym for horror, and mystery, and extravagance—when spectres and goblins, not to speak of more earthly terrors—of brigands and murderers—formed its unfailing *corps dramatique*—when the plot was invariably embellished with

‘Very pretty supernatural scenery,’

and was sure to involve a series of strange and unearthly incidents and adventures. In the days of which we write, a book with such a title as that which stands above—its scene laid in the Black Forest, the traditionary abode of wonder and romance, and its interest placed among the wild foresters of that primitive region, would, as a matter of course, have been crammed “brimful of horrors,” with ghost-haunted castles and bandit-haunted caverns, with savage barons and love-lorn maidens, with a heroine conceived upon the model of “Gertrude of the Ice-cold Heart,” and a hero the legitimate representative of “Bloody Berthold of the Mummel-See,” or “Schinder Hans, the Robber of the Rhine.”

If the reader take up Auerbach's volumes, anticipating anything like this, he will be far from forming a correct notion of their contents. And, indeed, we hardly know

any more gratifying evidence of the revolution which has been quietly effected in the literature and the literary tastes of the new generation in Germany, than is supplied in these exquisitely simple tales. Of the wild extravagance, the over-strained romance, the sickly sentiment, the silly, though solemn, philosophy, which were the characteristics of the older school of fiction, he will not find a single trace. These tales appear almost to realize the ideal towards which certain later writers of German fiction have begun to strive, and which had been utterly disregarded by their predecessors—a simple and unstudied delineation of nature in the moral and social, as well as in the physical, order. So hopelessly, indeed, had the German novelists failed in this particular, that critics began to regard the failure as the result, not so much of a defect of taste, as of some peculiar constitution of the national mind, similar to that which pervades the philosophical writings of Germany, and which leads their so-called philosophers to confound simplicity with common-place, to regard novelty and originality as the great desideratum in authorship, to imagine that an opinion which had been originated, or an argument which had been advanced, by another, was, by the very fact, unworthy of repetition, and to prefer the most shallow and contemptible theory, provided it wore the appearance of novelty, to the best and most profound views of the writers who had gone before them. There are some of the German novelists in whom this is absolutely provoking. Take up one of the tales of Tieck—a writer whose powers of description (when he chooses to keep within bounds) are scarcely surpassed by our very best authors. You find—as, for example, in his “*Reisender*,” or “*Die Gemählde*”—a story conceived in the best and most attractive spirit:—you are presented with a scene, the details of which are unexceptionably delineated:—you are introduced to the leading characters of the tale in a style which would not dishonour the best and most graphic of the “*Sketches by Boz* ;”—when, on a sudden, the effect of the whole is destroyed by some unaccountable extravagance, some grotesquely unnatural conception—the more extravagant and unaccountable because, in almost every instance, it will prove a mere excrescence on the story, not only not essential to the plan, but actually an impediment to its effective development. Those who have read

Goethe's "Wilhelm Meister," and still more, that very objectionable story, the "Wahl-verwandtschaften," will easily recollect numberless instances of the singular defect to which we allude; and it is still more remarkable in Hoffmann—than whom none can be more natural and effective when he pleases;—and, above all, in that strange compound of contradictory qualities—the great master at once of the grotesque and of the simple—Jean Paul Richter.

Of late years, however, this false taste has begun to be discarded. Singularity is no longer absolutely indispensable as an evidence of genius, and a writer may occasionally venture to be natural, without incurring the character of dullness and stupidity. A good deal of the reform of taste thus effected, may be traced to the influence of foreign literature, to the imitation, intentional or unconscious, of foreign models—of the English novelists, and, perhaps even more, of the Swedish authoress, Frederika Bremer, whose works have become extremely popular in Germany. But the principal share of the credit is unquestionably due to one man, who, though his religious views are of a class which we should be sorry to think likely to be permanently popular, has succeeded in founding a most important and influential school in literature—Heinrich Zschokke, the historian, philosopher, and novelist. The name of this remarkable man is, very possibly, new to many of our readers. A few of his minor tales have been translated, chiefly in the popular literary journals; his works are occasionally referred to and criticized in our foreign magazines and reviews; but it is only by an intimate knowledge of the domestic literary life of Germany, and a close and attentive observation of the new characteristics of popular German fiction, that it is possible to estimate the hold which he has gained of the affections of his countrymen, and the influence which he exercises upon the taste of readers as well as of writers. We must not be understood, however, as implying that the "Tales of the Black Forest" belong to what we have been describing as Zschokke's school of fiction. It would be difficult to find any points of resemblance between them and Zschokke's tales, even those—as, for example, "The Goldmaker's Village"—which possess a certain analogy of subject with Auerbach's, and are laid in scenes which, in the main, must be regarded as similar. The only point of

similarity which we would suggest, and indeed the only one which we believe to exist, is the simplicity and truth, the total absence of extravagance and mysticism, the hearty and natural tone which are common to both, and in which unhappily both alike differ from the rest of their countrymen. The novels of Zchokke are essentially and professedly practical; they all tend to some fixed and settled purpose; all inculcate some definite lesson. In the pursuit of this strong and engrossing purpose he never condescends to loiter by the way; he is never tempted into a digression for mere embellishment or amusement, never describes as a pure literary exercise, or sketches for the mere sketching's sake. With him the moral is always the first and last object; to its requirements everything else is subordinate, everything else is made to bend, or even sacrificed altogether. Not that his tales are without ornament, or simply dry and didactic expositions of the moral and social truths which they are intended to inculcate: on the contrary, they abound with ornament and with humour, and there is not one of them which does not contain scenes fully equal in interest and in excitement to anything which we meet in works which aim at no higher object. But it is easy to see, notwithstanding, that with the author this is a secondary consideration; that it is never sought for its own sake; and that it is never introduced except for the purpose of making yet more practical and impressive the practical lesson which the tale is intended to subserve. With Auerbach, on the contrary, it is never so. His stories, with the exception of one or two, especially "*Der Lauterbacher*," (which is not comprised in Mrs. Taylor's translation,) are mere sketches illustrative of the manners and usages of a race regarding whom but little had previously been known;—with scarcely any higher aim, however, than that of creating an interest in the scenes and characters which they describe;—and although they all, in a greater or less degree, embody some valuable moral or social principle, and are full of instruction for the simple peasantry for whom they are written, yet, for the most part, this rather lies in the general spirit and tendency of the tale, than is formally proposed either in the plot or its development.

The real charm of Auerbach's tales is their great simplicity, their evident truth, their unmistakeable fidelity to nature—doubly valuable and effective, because the scenes

and subjects have the advantage, almost unknown in these days of common-place, of freshness and novelty. The villages of the Black Forest are—or rather were, till they became classical under Auerbach's pen—a *terra incognita* even for the natives of the neighbouring provinces; and among the numberless loiterers whom a visit to Baden-Baden annually places within an easy distance of its inmost fastnesses, few could boast a more intimate acquaintance with the locality than may be gathered in the glorious view from the battlements of the Alte Schloss, or a hasty excursion to the Kinzig-Thal or the Donau-Schingen. And yet the population of this primitive region will, in many respects, furnish a more interesting subject for examination than that of any other among the German provinces. Struggling for centuries against the combined disadvantages of a barren soil, a harsh and ungrateful climate, and a severe and unsympathising government, they have continued, nevertheless, by patient and provident industry, to maintain themselves in independence, and indeed in comparative comfort. Isolated by their tastes and habits, as much as by their position, they have continued to stand apart from the rest of society in Germany, uninfluenced by its vicissitudes, and unmodified by its caprices; and thus it is that they present the singular, and now almost unique, picture of a population of the nineteenth century, not only with the costume, the usages, and the manners, but even with the ideas and views of the seventeenth. It is true that they have shared in that great common reform by which the German peasant has been transformed from a serf and cottier into the owner of the soil upon which he had been born in serfdom; but the change has not been attended with results so striking as might at first sight be expected; and the Black Forest villager lives on according to the same traditionary routine which he received from his fathers, and which it is a matter of course that he should transmit to his descendants.

The Tales are eleven in number, nine of which will be found in Mrs. Taylor's pretty volume. It would be difficult to speak too highly of the accuracy of her translation. From the strongly idiomatic character of the original, the task was one of exceeding difficulty, and indeed one which none but a native of Germany could attempt with a hope of success. Not only do the stories

overflow with provincial idioms and proverbial expressions, and with allusions utterly unintelligible without a knowledge of the locality and its usages; but the whole, or nearly the whole, of the dialogue, and all the rustic songs and ballads, are in the patois of the district, which, even with the aid of the best dictionaries, would be as hopelessly mysterious to a foreigner as the ballads of Burns or the Ettrick Shepherd, or the rich Doric dialogues in the *Waverley Novels*. It is true that she has used the liberty of abridging, and omitting, and condensing rather freely in some of the tales, especially in "*Ivo der Hajrle*;" but although to a Black Forest reader the part suppressed would have had a deep interest from its purely local character, we doubt whether the general reader is not rather a gainer by the suppression.*

But it is time to present the reader with a sketch from this novel and interesting collection. We shall take one, almost at random from the first tale in the series, which is entitled "*Tolpatsch*." Here then, good reader, is Tolpatsch in his own proper person.

"Yes, good Tolpatsch! I see you now standing before me, in your own proper form and figure, with your short-clipped flaxen hair, left only to grow over the neck behind in one long patch; and I can fancy you looking at me too, with your broad face, your full blue staring eyes, and your half-open mouth. Ah! little did either of us dream, when in our favourite lane, where now stands the row of new houses, you cut a hazel twig to make me a pipe, that I should one day tell the world of Tolpatsch, when we were so far apart!

"Ay, and how well do I still remember your whole dress! but that to be sure is no difficult matter; for shirt, red braces, and linen trowsers (prudently black, to meet any mishap),—this was all. On Sunday indeed things were different: then you sported

* We must not be considered over sensitive if we make one observation with reference to the translation. Mrs. Taylor, throughout her volume, has translated *Pfarrer* (which, it is hardly necessary to say, is the title of the parish clergyman, whether Catholic or Protestant) by the English word *parson*. This, of course, is a matter of little moment, though the peasantry of the Black Forest are almost exclusively Catholic, and are represented as such in the Tales. But we have only observed two instances [in p. 116, and in p. 314,] where it is translated "*priest*," and, in both instances, this translation has the effect, perhaps not intended, of fixing upon the priest a coarse and ill-natured insinuation.

your poodle cap,* your blue jacket with its large buttons, the scarlet waistcoat, the short yellow leather breeches, the white stockings, and clattering shoes, not forgetting the fresh red carnation stuck behind your ear. But this gaudy attire never became you, so I return to you in your everyday clothes."—pp. 1, 2.

It may be as well to explain, before we proceed further, that this singular title† of our hero is but a Black Forest soubriquet, which the wicked humour of his fellow villagers, or his own dull and clownish, though good natured appearance, had drawn upon him. His proper christian name, (though there were but few who addressed him by it,) was Aloys; and according to the local usage which the intermixture of families renders necessary, in order to distinguish individuals of the same common surname, he was known in the village as "Bartels Basche's Bua," "the son of Bartholomew, the son of Sebastian." With all his simple good-humour, Aloys did not relish the soubriquet by which he was almost universally addressed among those of his own standing.

"Our friend Aloys therefore preferred the company of us children, although he was seventeen years old: in safe and secret spots he would play with us at ninepins or building houses, or race about with us in the field; and whenever Tolpatsch (I should say Aloys) was with us, we were safe from any attack of the children at the limekiln; for in truth all the young folks of the village were constantly divided into two hostile parties, who made war upon one another on every convenient occasion.

"Now the lads of the same age as our friend Aloys were already beginning to act their part in the village; they met together every evening, and, like their elders, went singing and whistling along the road, or stood joking and laughing in front of the little inn which boasted the sign of the Eagle, teasing the girls for pastime as they passed by. But the most distinguished badge of a grown-up lad is his pipe; and there they would all stand, looking so proud, each with his silver-mounted pipe in his mouth, decked with a little silver chain and with a bowl of real Ulm ware. The pipes indeed were not lighted, except now and then some one ventured to steal a red coal from the baker's fire, when the maid's back was turned: and then you should have seen their joyous faces, smoking and puffing away, however sick it made them.

* "A cloth cap with a fur edging, without peak, and with a tassel of gold thread in the middle."

† Tolpatsch, Heavy clownish fellow.

"Aloys too had already begun to smoke, but only quite in secret. One Sunday evening he let the end of his pipe peep out of his breast-pocket, and ventured thus among his companions. 'Hallo!' cried one of them, as he snatched the pipe from Aloys' pocket. Aloys demanded it back, but in vain; it passed quickly from hand to hand, amidst shouts of laughter; and when Aloys grew more and more impatient, the pipe had vanished, and they all pretended to know nothing of it. Aloys pulled and twitched first one and then another, begging for his pipe with tears in his eyes; but they all only laughed the more. Then he snatched off the cap of the lad who had stolen his pipe, and ran with it into the house of Jacob the smith. This manœuvre had the desired effect; the culprit fetched the pipe, which had been hidden in the wood-stack, and gave it back to Aloys.

"The house of the smith, Jacob Bomüller, was the constant resort of Aloys; whenever he was not at home, he was sure to be found there; and he never stayed within-doors when he had done his work. The wife of Jacob the smith was his aunt; and, like his mother and a few of us children, Mistress Apollonia and her eldest daughter Marannele called him by his right name, Aloys.

"Aloys rose early in the morning, and when he had given hay and water to his two cows and his calf, he used to go to Jacob's house, and knock, until Marannele came and opened the door. Then, after just wishing her 'Good-morning,' he went through the cow-shed into the barn. The animals all knew him, and lowed in a familiar way every time he passed, and turned their heads to look at him. Then he went into the barn, fetched some hay, and with a pitchfork filled the mangers of the two oxen and the two cows. Aloys' prime favourite was the white-faced cow; he had brought her up from a calf, and as he stood by and watched her feeding, she would often turn and lick his hand, which by the way was no bad aid to his morning toilet. And then, when he opened the door of the shed, and made it all clean and in order, he had a kind word for each of the animals in turn, as he pushed them first to this side and then to that. No yard in the whole village was so neat as Jacob the smith's. Aloys washed and curried the oxen and cows,* till you could have seen your face in their sleek sides; and having done so, he ran to the pump which stood in front of the house, and pumped the trough full of water. Then he let the animals out of the shed, and whilst they were drinking he strewed for them a litter of clean straw.

"When Marannele came into the stable, to milk the cows, all was sure to be neat and in order. Often, when a cow was unruly, and kicked, and would not be milked, Aloys would go up to her,

* [A practice common in Ireland and in some parts of England. TRANSL.]

stand by her side, and pat her on the back, so that Marannele could milk her better. Aloys managed somehow never to have finished his work: he had always something more to busy himself about; and when Marannele would say, 'Aloys, thou art a brave lad!' instead of answering or looking up, he only went on sweeping the stable with his broom the more vigorously, as if he would sweep up the very stones out of the floor. Then he went and cut hay in the barn for the whole day, and having finished this work, he ran to the pump and fetched water for the kitchen, chopped some sticks for firewood, and when all was done betook himself to Jacob's sitting-room.

Presently Marannele brought the dish of porridge, put it on the table, folded her hands, while every one did the same, and said grace. After this, they sat down to table. All ate out of the same dish, and Aloys would often help himself from the corner where Marannele dipped her spoon. They sat thus at table still and serious, as if some holy ceremony were being performed, and seldom a word was spoken. When dinner was ended, and thanks had been returned, Aloys took up his cap and strolled merrily home.

"Thus did our friend Aloys pass his days until he was nineteen years old; and when new-year's-day came, and Marannele made him a present of a shirt, the hemp of which she had herself gathered, which she herself had spun, bleached and sewn, then Aloys' happiness was complete. The only thing that troubled him was that he could not walk along the road in his shirt-sleeves; he would not have felt the cold, in spite of the frost and snow; but the village-folks had laughed him out of this, and Aloys grew more and more sensitive to the jokes of the neighbours.

"The servant-lad of the old Bailiff, who had come to the village since the harvest-time, was at the bottom of it all; he was a tall, handsome young fellow, with a bold look, the effect of which was heightened by red moustachios. Jörgli (George), for that was the lad's name, was a horse-soldier, and almost always wore his military cap. On a Sunday, when he strode through the village, upright as a may-pole, with a swaggering air, turning his feet out and making his spurs ring, with his soldier's cap stuck knowingly upon his head, and his leather-striped pantaloons, his whole figure seemed to say, 'Ay, ay, the girls may well fall in love with me!' Or when he rode out his horses to drink at Jacob's pump, Aloys' heart was ready to burst as he saw Marannele peeping out of the window every time; and he wished in his heart there was no such thing as milk or butter in the world, so that he too might be a groom and have the charge of horses.

"Inexperienced as our friend Aloys was, he knew well enough the difference between the three classes of servant-lads. Lowest in rank was the cowherd, whose beasts of draft* have also to pro-

* [In Germany milch-cows are often used for draft.—TRANSL.]

vide calves and milk ; next came the herdsman of the oxen, whose beasts, besides working, can be fattened and killed for food. But foremost of all was the groom, whose cattle give neither meat nor milk, but which nevertheless fare the best and often fetch the highest price."—pp. 2-8.

This Jörgli was doomed to be the plague and the trial of poor Tolpatsch's life, and upon their simple race of rustic rivalry the story is made to turn. The manner in which this is wrought out, will illustrate the leading points on which Auerbach differs from most of the novel writers of his country. Few German writers could have resisted the temptation of indulging, upon an occasion apparently so appropriate, in a lengthened and sentimental disquisition upon the motives and feelings under which poor Tolpatsch might be supposed to act, accompanied probably by a proportionate amount of metaphysical speculation on the nature of the affections generally, and the various phases in which they develop themselves. Still more would this course have been pursued by a writer of the French school. But Auerbach, true in this particular to the Swedish model, which we cannot help thinking he frequently purposed to himself, contents himself with simply telling what Tolpatsch *did*, and leaves the reader to infer from his artless narrative what he *felt*, under the circumstances which are thus unpretendingly described.

It would be idle to attempt any condensation of the story, and we shall therefore content ourselves with another extract. Tolpatsch attributing his rival's superiority to his soldierly air and appearance, resolves under the same impulse which actuated the Antwerp blacksmith, whom

Connubialis amor de mulcibre fecit Apellem,

that he too will be a soldier like Jörgli. When he has completed his twentieth year, and the day of drawing for enrolment approaches, he prays fervently that he may not draw a free number. Marannele, on the contrary, in evidence of her affection, gives him as he is about to start for the place of drawing a lucky farthing, which was made, according to the simple belief of the country, out of one of those silver dishes, which are supposed to fall from the sky every time a star falls at night, and was regarded as an infallible preservative against every untoward accident. Tolpatsch, however, is resolved not to be baulked of his purpose.

"Aloys took the farthing and went his way; but as he crossed the bridge over the Neckar, he drew it from his pocket, shut his eyes close, and threw it into the river. 'No, I will *not* be free,—I will be a soldier: only wait awhile, Jörgli!' As he exclaimed thus, he clenched his fists and drew himself up proudly.

"In the inn at Horb, which bore the sign of the Angel, the Bailiff sat, waiting for his lads to assemble; and when they were all met, he went with them to the town-hall. The Bailiff was a stupid clown, who nevertheless gave himself the air of an important magistrate. He had once been a sergeant in the army, and evidently attached vast consequence to his office, treating all the countryfolks, both old and young, as if they were mere raw recruits. On their way to the town-hall he said to Aloys, 'Tolpatsch, my boy, I know you'll draw a high lot; but even if you draw No. 1, you need not trouble yourself,—they can make nothing of *you* for a soldier.'

"'Who knows?' said Aloys boldly; 'I may be a sergeant as well as another; I can read and write and reckon as well as any one; and I suppose the old sergeants have not swallowed *all* the cleverness in the world!'

"The Bailiff was in a huff, and looked at him fiercely.

"When Aloys went up to the wheel where the lots were drawn, there was a kind of bold defiance in his manner: he put his hand into the wheel, and seized several papers, shut his eyes fast, as if not to see what he took, and drew out a lot. He trembled as he held it up, fearing it might be a high number; but when he heard the court-crier call out 'Number 17!' he shouted so loud for joy that the folks had to tell him to be quiet.

"The lads now all bought themselves nosegays of artificial flowers, tied with red ribands, and after taking a hearty draught, away they went home: our friend Aloys shouted and sang the loudest of any.

"In the road, at the entrance to the village, the mothers and a number of lasses were waiting for the return of the young men: Marannele was among them. Aloys went arm-in-arm with his comrades, not very steadily indeed, but more intoxicated with the shouting and excitement than with wine. He had never before shown this intimacy with the others, but to-day they were all alike. When his mother saw number 17 stuck on the hat of her dear Aloys, she fell a-weeping bitterly, and exclaimed again and again, 'God help us! God help us!' And Marannele said to Aloys aside, 'What can you have done with my farthing?' 'I have lost it,' replied Aloys; but although he hardly knew what he was saying, this fib went to his very soul.

"The lads now went singing into the village, and the mothers and sweethearts of those who were drawn as recruits went weeping after them, and drying their tears with a corner of their aprons.

"There were still six weeks to the examination of the young

recruits, when they had all to appear before the Doctor and receive his certificate of their fitness for service. Aloys' mother Mary took a large pat of butter and a basketful of eggs, and went to the wife of the Doctor: truly the butter looked remarkably smooth and tempting, in spite of the cold weather. Mistress Mary received the assurance that her son Aloys should be let off; 'for,' said the conscientious Doctor, 'Aloys really is not able to serve; he is shortsighted, and that makes him so often clumsy and awkward.'

"Aloys however did not trouble himself about all these stories; he was wholly altered, and went whistling and strolling through the village.

"The day for the examination came at last. The lads went this time more quietly to the town. When Aloys' turn came, and he was called into the examiner's room, he said in a bold tone, 'Try me as you will, you'll find nothing to prevent my serving.' Then he had to stand under the measure, and being of the full height he was enlisted as a soldier. The Doctor forgot all about his shortsightedness, the butter and eggs; Aloys' bold tone put it all out of his mind.

"Now that the matter had become serious, and Aloys was irrevocably drawn as a soldier, he grew anxious, and was ready to shed tears. But when he was leaving the town-hall, and his mother rose weeping from the stone steps to meet him, his pride returned, and he said, 'Mother, this is not right; you must not weep; I shall be back in a year, and in the meantime my brother Xavier can manage our little field.'

"When Aloys returned home, after the merry-making among the recruits in the village, Marannele with tears in her eyes gave him a bunch of rosemary, tied with red ribands, and sewed it to his cap. But Aloys pulled out his pipe, smoked away as he went through the village, and spent the evening merrily with his comrades till late at night.

"The next was a painful day to pass; it was the day when the recruits had to go to Stuttgart. Aloys went early to Jacob's house; Marannele was in the stable; she had now all the work to do alone. 'Marannele,' said Aloys, 'give me your hand.' She gave it him, and he said, 'Promise me, Marannele, one thing,—that you will not marry until I come back.' 'I promise you,' she replied earnestly. 'Then,' said he, 'I am ready; but stop—come, Marannele, give me a parting kiss.' Marannele kissed him, and the cows and oxen looked at them as if they knew what was going on.

"Aloys now patted each cow and ox again, and as he took leave of them they lowed, as if to wish him good bye in return.

"Jörgli had put to his horses, to drive the recruits a few miles on their way, and so they went singing through the village. Conrad, the Baker's son, who played the clarionet, sat with the rest in the cart, and accompanied the songs which the others sang.

They went slowly along at a foot-pace; on every side friends pressed around stretching out a hand or a parting-glass, and bidding them farewell.

"Marannele looked out at the window, and greeted the lads as they passed. When they approached the end of the village, they all joined again in chorus:

'Away, away, and away!

The sluggard at home may stay.'

But when they were out of the village, Aloys became on a sudden as still as a mouse; he looked all round him, and his eyes were filled with tears. Close to this spot, upon the heath called Box-hill, Marannele had bleached the linen of which the shirt he had on was made: the threads seemed as if they were burning, he felt so hot. As he passed, he bade a sad adieu to all the trees by the roadside, and to those well-known fields. There lay the 'Home-field,' which he had so often dug and tilled, that he knew every little stone in it: there it was that last harvest he had cut the corn with Marannele. A little further, down in the 'Close,' lay his field of clover; he had sown it, but alas! he should not be there to watch its growth. Thus he gazed long and sorrowfully around; and as they drove slowly down the road, Aloys looked straight before him and said nothing. When they crossed the bridge his eyes were fixed upon the river; who knows whether at that moment he would have had the courage to throw away his lucky farthing?

"As the lads passed through the town they struck up their song again; but it was not until they had reached the top of the Bildechingen hill that Aloys once more breathed freely. He turned round, and on the opposite hill there lay his own dear Nordstetten, seemingly near enough for him to have spoken with the folks there, although in truth it was almost an hour's drive distant. He could see the yellow-painted house of old Jacob the blacksmith, with its green shutters, and two houses off lived Marannele! He waved his cap high in the air, and struck up the song again,—'Away, away, and away!'

"Jörgli drove the recruits as far as Herrenberg, and from that village they were to proceed on foot. At parting Jörgli said to Aloys, 'Have you no message to send to Marannele?' Aloys' face grew scarlet in a moment; Jörgli was the last man in the world to whom he would entrust a message, and yet he was on the point of saying something kind for Marannele; but involuntarily he broke out into the exclamation, 'You need not have any thing to say to Marannele,—she cannot bear you!' Jörgli laughed and drove off.

"On the road the recruits had another memorable adventure: in the Böblingen wood they met a peasant with his cart, and they

forced him to drive them to the end of the forest, a distance of five miles. Aloys was the foremost in this prank; he had often and often heard Jörgli tell of the bold tricks which soldiers played, and he wished to do the same. Nevertheless, when they reached the end of the wood, Aloys was the first to open his leather purse and give the peasant something for his trouble.

"At the Tübingen gate in Stuttgart the newly-arrived recruits were received by a sergeant. Several Nordstetten soldiers had gone out to meet their countrymen; Aloys bit his lip when they all cried out, 'Good day, Tolpatsch!' The singing had now stopped, and the recruits were led to the barracks like a flock of sheep. Aloys told his countrymen that he should like to enter the cavalry as a volunteer (for he wanted to be as much as possible like Jörgli); but when he heard that in that case he would have to go home again, as the cavalry exercise would not begin before the autumn, he bethought himself, 'No, that will never do; I must return home quite an altered man; and then let any one of you call me Tolpatsch indeed, I'll Tolpatsch you!'"—pp. 17-24.

We pass over his "joining," his initiatory drill, his untiring industry in learning the exercise, his lessons in dancing, the painting of his portrait, and the sending it home to his mother, with permission to show it to Marannele. Alas, alas, Marannele was but a heartless jilt, unworthy of poor Tolpatsch's simple truth! He obtains leave of absence, and revisits his home.

"Evening was closing in when he reached the hill at the entrance to Bildechingen. Before him lay his dear Nordstetten—his home. He no longer sang, but stood still and thoughtful, and touched his cap involuntarily to welcome the sight of his native village.

"Aloys walked slowly on, for he wished not to reach home before nightfall, so that he might surprise all his friends the next morning. His house was one of the first in the village; there was a light in the room; he tapped at the window, and said, 'Is Aloys there?' 'Heaven preserve us! a gendarm!' cried his mother. 'No, no, it is I, mother,' said Aloys; and taking off his tall cap, to enter in at the low door, he ran and embraced her.

"After the first joy at meeting, the good woman was in great trouble that she had nothing left in the house to eat; however she went into the kitchen, and presently whipped up a couple of eggs and toasted a rasher of bacon. Aloys stood by her side on the hearth, and told her all that had happened. He inquired for Marannele too, and asked why his picture was still hanging there. But his mother answered, 'Pray, pray drive Marannele from your head,—she is a good-for-nothing hussy.'

"'Mother,' said Aloys, 'never speak to me of her so; I know what I know!' His face, which was red with the fire on the hearth, had a sad but resolute expression. His mother was silent; and as they went back into the sitting-room, her heart beat with joy and pride when she saw what a smart young fellow her Aloys had grown. She could hardly take her eyes off him, and at every mouthful he ate, her lips unconsciously imitated his, although she ate nothing. Then she lifted off his *tschako*, stroked his hair, and pitied him for having to carry such a cruel weight.

"The next morning Aloys rose early, brushed his cap, and polished his sword-belt and buttons more carefully than if he were going to a review. As the church-bell tolled the first time, he stood prepared and ready; and the second time it sounded, he went out into the village; on the road he heard two boys talking to one another.

"'Is n't that Tolpatsch?' said one.

"'No, no, it can't be he,' replied his companion.

"'Yes, but I am sure it is he,' said the first. Aloys looked sharply at the boys, and off they ran with their hymn-books tucked under their arm. Aloys walked straight up to the church, and all the villagers welcomed him kindly on his return. He passed by Marannele's house,—no one was looking out: then he went up the hill, looking back every instant; and entered the church porch just as the bell sounded the third time. He looked around, but nowhere saw Marannele; still he lingered at the door, but all the folks had gone in, and she was not among them. The singing now began; Marannele's voice was not heard: he could have distinguished it from among a thousand. What cared he now to be the object of attention to all! *Her* eyes were not upon him, and for her sake only had he come so far. But when the sermon was ended, and the parson read the bans of marriage between Marianne Bomüller of Nordstetten and Georg Melzer of Wiesenstetten, Aloys stood riveted to the spot; his knees tottered and his cheeks grew deadly pale. He was the first to leave the church, and ran home, scarcely knowing what he did, cast away his sword and cap, and hid himself in the hay and wept. He thought of Marannele, and then of his mother, and cried and sobbed aloud."—pp. 27-30.

This is too much for the simple trusting heart of our poor friend. He makes no effort to bear up against the shock, but avails himself soon after of the offer most opportunely made by an elder brother who had settled in America, purchases his discharge from the army, and, joining a party of emigrants from his native village, abandons for ever the country where his long cherished hopes had been thus sadly blighted. There is something in our judgment extremely beautiful in the conclusion of this simple sketch.

"In his last letter from the Ohio, Aloys writes to his mother as follows:

"I am often sad at heart to think that I should enjoy all this good fortune alone. How often do I wish that the whole of Nordstetten were here! old Zahn, blind Conrad, Schakkerle of the stone-quarry, Soges, and Maurice; they should all have as much as ever they could eat and drink in my house. Of what good is all this plenty to me, when I must enjoy it by myself? Then too you should see Tolpatsch with his four horses in the stable and ten foals in the field! How is Marannele? If she is not well off, write me word,—I will send her something. But she must not know from whom it comes: it grieves me to the very heart to think of her. Mathes of the Hill lives a few miles off. Mathilda is a good housekeeper, but she is not Marannele! I long to hear that she is well off and comfortable. Has she any children? On our voyage we had with us a very learned countryman of ours, Dr. Stäberle of Ulm, who showed me on a globe that when it is day in America it is night in Nordstetten, and the reverse: I did not think much about it at the time, but now, when I am in the fields, and wondering to myself what they are doing at Nordstetten, then it comes into my head, Potz blitz! they are at this minute asleep, and Schakkerle's son John the watchman is going his rounds, and calling, 'God and the Virgin keep us!' But the worst is on Sunday, to think that it is then Saturday night in Nordstetten. This should not be; all should have one day. Last Sunday evening we were at a dance at cousin Mathes', and I recollected that it was then the church festival in Nordstetten. I should never forget that, if I were to live a hundred years. Ah! I wish I could be in Nordstetten again, just for one hour; then I'd show the Bailiff what sort of a man a free citizen of America is. Farewell!"—pp. 36-38.

The tales, though each is distinct and independent of the rest, yet for the most part all contain allusions to the same circle of personages; and thus we do not lose sight of Tolpatsch altogether, although his history professedly terminates here. The reader will be gratified to find from one of the subsequent stories, that he became a prosperous and happy citizen of the Republic, and was fain to console himself for the loss of his faithless Marannele, by a union with the Mathilda to whom he alludes in the above extract. There is a long letter of his introduced into the story of "Ivo," which we regard as the very ideal of simple and natural tenderness and beauty. It is too long for insertion, but we promise the reader of "Tolpatsch," that as a supplement of this interesting little sketch, and as a pic-

ture of honest unsophisticated heartiness and simplicity, it will amply repay the trouble of perusal.

The general character of the remaining tales, (with the exception of "Ivo," which is much more elaborate,) will be sufficiently understood from what we have said of "Tolpatsch." The plot in most of them is exceedingly simple, and the narrative little more than a slender thread, by which the several sketches which they embody are connected together. Some of them, however, are extremely characteristic, and illustrate very strikingly the leading social peculiarities of this primitive land. Among these may be specially enumerated "The May Tree," and "The Axe," two sketches illustrative of village law in the Black Forest. They are drawn in a singularly bold and graphic style, and will be found doubly interesting from the novelty of the usages on which they are based.

We shall print, however, in preference, a passage from another, and in many respects a more painful story, entitled "Vefele." It illustrates very strikingly the operation of a feeling not peculiar to the Black Forest; the distrust and jealousy with which the peasantry regard the consolidation of landed property, and the habitual and almost instinctive tendency to regard the rise of any one even from among their own number to the class of "lord" or chief proprietor, as an addition to the number of their traditional enemies and oppressors.

It would carry us beyond our prescribed limit, to attempt an analysis of the plot. We shall be content with the following sketch, "the Peasant-lord," father of Vefele, the heroine of the story. How many home associations does it not suggest!

"For thirty years the Peasant-lord had dwelt in the village; but whenever he fell out with any one, the nickname given him was 'the Baisingen straw-walker,' and his wife was called 'the crooked-back lady of Baisingen.' Mistress Zahn was however by no means crook-backed; in her old age she was still a tall and handsome woman, with an erect carriage: her left foot was only a little too short, which occasioned her to limp in walking. This bodily defect however was at the same time the cause of her great wealth: her father, old Staufer, once said publicly in the village-inn, that his daughter's short foot mattered not, for that he would put a full measure of dollars under it, and it would be seen whether that did not make all straight.

"Old Staufer kept his word, and when Zahn married his daugh-

ter, he filled a measure with dollars, drew the strike across it, and said, 'There, all that is in the measure is yours!' To complete the joke, his daughter had to put her left foot upon it; and the corn-measure, thus filled with money, was placed as the chief ornament on the wedding-table.

"With this money Zahn soon afterwards bought the estate of the lord of Schleithelm: he built himself a large and splendid house, and thus got the name of 'the Peasant-lord.' Out of nine children, who were born to him, five lived to grow up, three sons and two daughters. His youngest child was Vefele: she was so fair and delicately formed, that, partly in envy, yet partly because they were forced to acknowledge her superiority, the villagers called her 'the lady.' Whenever her name was mentioned, it was the general remark, half in pity and half in spite, that Vefele was a 'marked child,' for she had inherited the short foot of her mother. The expression *marked* conveys an unfavourable meaning: people who are red-haired, hunchbacked, one-eyed, or limping, are commonly called so; as if these defects were a mark set upon them by Heaven, because those who bear them are usually ill-natured and not to be trusted. As a natural result, these unfortunate creatures, from being treated with scorn and suspicion, generally become cunning, bitter, and deceitful: an unjust prejudice at the outset calls forth those very consequences, which are afterwards regarded as a confirmation of the prejudice itself.

"Vefele indeed did nobody any harm; she was on the contrary good and kind to all; but the hatred of the whole village towards the Peasant-lord was extended to his children.

"The Peasant-lord carried on a lawsuit with the whole parish for eighteen years; he laid claim to the patronage belonging to the lord of the manor, and demanded the various dues, tributes, and other rights attaching to the soil: he had moreover fifty votes in the election of the Bailiff. But these customary dues were paid by the peasants with grumbling, and even open insult, so deep-rooted was their vexation and enmity. Thus it is with men! To a nobleman, a baron, or a count, these peasants would have paid all without a murmur; but now they cursed every grain which they had to give to a man whom they looked upon as one of themselves. The only mode of revenge which they could devise was to cut down the Peasant-lord's corn by night, when it was still green. But this only produced a twofold injury; for old Zahn laid his complaint before the Syndics, and succeeded in obtaining a decree, that, as the transgressors were not discovered, the damage should fall upon the parish, and he should be compensated out of the parish funds. Ever after the Peasant-lord had a ranger of his own, one-half of whose wages the village had to pay.

"The disagreements and bickerings between the Peasant-lord and the peasants of the village continued unabated.

"It happened that a new lawyer went to settle in the little town

of Sulz, and now began the lawsuit, in which as much paper was scribbled over as would have covered a whole acre of land.

"The village of Nordstetten, together with a large portion of the Black Forest, at that time belonged to Austria. The Governor resided at Rottenburg, and the Court of Appeal was in Freiburg; but a cause of great importance might be carried even further; and, from the complicated nature of the proceedings in a distant jurisdiction, it was easy to keep a lawsuit in constant doubt and confusion until doomsday.

"In time the quarrel between the Peasant-lord and his neighbours grew into an open strife between the inhabitants of Baisingen and Nordstetten. The Baisingen folks jeered and bantered the others at market or in the town, whenever they and the Nordstetters met; calling them in derision their subjects and servants, because a Baisingen peasant ruled over them. The Nordstetten folks in their turn gave tit for tat, and were always ready with as good a word to give back. At first both parties laughed and joked at one another only as 'good friends;' but by degrees the taunts and insults grew more and more rude, and ere they were aware, war had broken out on both sides, and they came to a good hearty cudgelling-match. This first took place at the market of Ergenzingen, and from that time the Nordstetters and the Baisingers could never meet without coming to blows; whenever the young men of the two villages met at a dance or a wedding, however peaceable at first, the feast always ended in a pitched battle.

"The Peasant-lord dwelt in the middle of the village, as in a desert; no one spoke to him, no one visited him. The instant he showed his face in the village inn, all was in a moment still, and it always seemed to him as if the folks had that instant been talking of him. He laid his tobacco-bag, filled with the best tobacco, on the table; but no one would ever ask for or accept a pipeful. At first old Zahn took all the pains he could, by kindness and friendly behaviour, to dissipate the general and apparently concerted enmity; for he was by nature a good-hearted man, though somewhat austere. But when he saw that it was of no avail, he scorned them all, set them at defiance, and obstinately resolved to make good his rights. He kept entirely aloof from all the villagers, hired day-labourers from Ahldorf to till his fields, and, as if he would not even worship God together with his neighbours, he went every Sunday morning to church at Horb. As he thus walked forth, his carriage was stately, although he was short-set and broad-shouldered: his three-cornered hat was stuck a little on the left side, with a bold air, and the broad part brought in front, so that the shadow which it cast on his features made them look darker and more serious than they were in reality. He strode along with a firm step, and the large silver buttons set in a close row on his blue coat, without a collar, and the round silver but-

tons on his red waistcoat, jingled one against another as clear as a bell.

"The mother and her children, but especially her two daughters, Agatha and Vefele, suffered most by this estrangement from the villagers; and often did they weep together and lament their lot, whilst old Zahn was sitting till a late hour over a bottle of wine with his lawyer in the town. The rancorous feeling in the village went so far, that even the poor people, for fear of the rest, dared not receive alms from the Peasant-lord's house; and it was only in secret, and unknown both to old Zahn and the villagers, that the good woman and her daughters practised their charity: they took potatoes, corn and meal by stealth, as if they were thieving, into the garden, where the poor folks waited to receive their bounty."—pp. 60-66.

By far the longest, however, and in every respect the most finished of Auerbach's tales, is the last in Mrs. Taylor's volume, "*Ivo*," or as it stands in the original, "*Ivo, the Young Priest*."* It is the story of a pious and simple peasant youth, who, under an impulse of childish enthusiasm, has devoted himself to the ecclesiastical profession, and, without fully investigating his dispositions, or strictly questioning his heart as to the state of life which he would really prefer, pursues his clerical studies, partly because such is the pious wish of his parents, and especially of his fond and thoroughly religious mother; partly because he is for a long time actually unconscious of any indisposition on his own part towards the profession for which he has been designed. In the end, however, his dispositions become apparent to himself; and after a hard contest with his own feelings, and with his reluctance to give pain to his parents, he abandons his studies, settles down into a Black Forest peasant, and marries Emmerenz, one of his early playmates, for whom even as a child, he had formed an affection which he long suppressed, and of whose depth and fervour he was long unconscious. The story is told with perfect simplicity and with great tenderness and purity throughout; and though some may be inclined at first sight to question the propriety of its moral, yet, although it has some serious defects to which we shall allude hereafter, we are disposed on the whole to think, that the lesson is one which may not be without its application among ourselves. We shall

* "*Ivo der Hajrle*" — *Hajrle* being a local idiomatic form for *Pfarrlein*, or *Herrlein*.

make no apology, therefore, for extracting at some length from this interesting little tale, more indeed for the sake of its own simple beauty, than with a view to any critical observation, beyond barely what may be necessary, in order to correct what we believe to be the questionable tendency of some of the author's views.

The tale opens with the event which first gave the impulse to Ivo's wishes, and excited in his childish imagination the idea of devoting himself to the Church—the *Primitivæ*, (or the first Mass and Sermon,) of a young priest of Ivo's native village. In the Catholic provinces of Germany, this ceremony is always a high festival.

"The following morning dawned brightly on the village. Ivo was drest by his mother betimes, in a new jacket of striped German velvet, with (as he fancied) silver buttons, and in short, well-washed leather breeches: he was to carry the crucifix. Gretle, Ivo's eldest sister, took him by the hand and led him into the road,—‘to make room in the house,’ as she said: then enjoining him not to come inside the door again, she hastened back to her work. Ivo went into the village; the men and lads were standing about in groups, half drest, without coat or jacket. Here and there women and girls were running from one house to another, without their smart bodices, their hair but partly drest, and carrying the fluttering red hair-ribands in their hands. Ivo thought it a great piece of tyranny in his sister to drive him from the house; he would have enjoyed nothing so much as to have gone out, like the men, first in his shirt-sleeves, and then, as soon as the bell tolled, to have appeared in full splendour; but he dared not return home, nor indeed ventured to sit down anywhere, for fear of spoiling his clothes; so he went cautiously through the village.

"Waggon after waggon arrived, bringing peasants and their wives from a distance; stools and chairs were brought out of the houses, and placed for the visitors to alight, who were cordially received and welcomed. Every one appeared this day thoroughly joyous at heart and elated, like the inhabitants of a village welcoming back in triumph a victorious hero to the place of his birth. The whole way from the church to the Boxhill the road was strewn with grass and flowers, which shed a sweet perfume around. The Bailiff came out of Christle the tailor's house, and remained uncovered until he found himself in the road again. Soges too was decked out smartly, with a newly-japanned sword-belt, and shone in all his glory.

"The Bailiff's lady soon afterwards made her appearance, leading by the hand her little daughter Båbele, a girl six years of age. Båbele was drest like a bride; she had the *Schappel** with the

* A chaplet of glittering silver spangles.

little wreath upon her head, and was splendidly attired; in fact Båbele was to act the bride of the young ecclesiastic in the approaching ceremony. The bell tolled, and, as if by magic, the groups of peasants in their shirt-sleeves suddenly dispersed, and went home to dress themselves in proper trim; Ivo went to the church.

"Amidst the sound of the bells, the procession at length moved out of the church. The flags fluttered, the town-band of music, which had come expressly from Horb, played lustily, and, mingled with all the other sounds, were heard the prayers of the men and women. Ivo walked in front, by the side of the Schoolmaster, carrying the crucifix. Upon the Boxhill stood the altar, beautifully adorned; the chalices and lamps, and the spangled robes of the saints, glittered in the sun, and the multitude stretched over field and hill.

"The young priest now ascended the steps of the altar, folding his fair hands upon his breast; he was clad in a gold-embroidered garment, his bare head ornamented only with the gilt chaplet; with a pallid and pious expression, he bowed low continually, amid the sounds of music. Ivo hardly dared to look up. Before him walked the Bailiff's daughter Båbele, who, as his bride, bore in her hand a lighted taper, wound round with rosemary: she took her place by the side of the altar.

"The high mass began, and when the little bell tinkled, all the multitude fell prostrate on the ground; not a sound was heard, except the fluttering of a flight of doves, which passed directly over the altar. Ivo would not have looked up at that instant for the world: he thought to himself that the Holy Spirit was then descending, to change the wine and bread, and that no mortal eye could venture to look up without being blinded.

"The Chaplain of Horb now ascended the pulpit, and addressed the young priest in a solemn and impressive manner; after which the latter also went up into the pulpit. Ivo sat not far off, on a footstool; with his right elbow fixed upon his knee, and his chin resting upon his hand, he listened attentively: he understood little of what was said, but his eyes were rivetted upon the lips and the look of the preacher, who spoke from the heart, and his whole mind was filled with childlike and loving thoughts of God and of the good priest.

"When the procession set out again homeward, amidst the ringing of bells and the triumphal sounds of the music, Ivo seized the crucifix fast with both his hands. The crowd now gradually dispersed; every one spoke with rapture of the young priest, and said how blest the parents of such a son must be. Christle the tailor and his wife went down the covered flight of steps upon the hill-side, their hearts overflowing with blissful feelings. They were not people ordinarily thought much of, but to-day all pressed up to them with marked respect, to offer their congratulations. The

good woman thanked them with her looks, but her eyes were filled with tears of joy, and she could not speak for weeping. Ivo was told by his cousin from REXINGEN, who had come to be present at the ceremony, that Gregory's parents had thenceforth to address him with respect and deference.

"Is that true, mother?" he asked.

"Certainly," she replied; "he is now greater than any of us."

"But their happiness did not end here; the actual worldly advantage that must accrue to Christle the tailor was not forgotten in the general talk: people said that he was now provided for as long as he lived. Gregory's sister Cordele too would no doubt be his housekeeper, and Gregory would prove a blessing to his family and an honour to the whole village.

"Ivo walked home between his parents, each leading him by the hand. 'Father,' said he, 'Gregory should be the parson here.'

"That would not do," said his father; "a priest is never to serve in the place where he is born."

"Why not?"

"Pshaw! with your continual, silly *why!*—because it is so," answered Valentine. But his wife added, "You know, Ivo, he would have too many friends and kinsfolk in the village, and would not be impartial."

"The fact was, the good woman either did not herself know, or could not explain to the child, that in such a case the sanctity of the office, and the reverence for the person of the priest, would be diminished by the knowledge of his origin and his growth from infancy to manhood.

"After a while Valentine said, 'Upon my word, the parson leads the best life in the world; *he* never gets hard skin on his hands from ploughing, nor back-ache from reaping, and yet the barn at the parsonage is as full as his neighbours'. He lies on his sofa, and thinks over his sermon, and makes all his family happy. Ivo, my boy, if you are a good lad, you may one day be a priest yourself: would you like it?"

"Ay, that I should," said Ivo eagerly, looking up at his father with wistful eyes; "but you should never say your Reverence to me," he added.

"Well, well, there's time enough to think about those matters," answered Valentine smiling."—pp. 183-189.

We cannot help thinking this extremely beautiful. It presents, in a few delicate touches, all the leading familiarities of the characters of the chief actors in the story; the hard and worldly, but yet, in his own way, honest and affectionate father, the humble and pious, though doatingly and even proudly fond mother, and the artless enthusiastic child; and it lets us into the whole detail of life at Nord-

stetten, as completely as though all its every-day minutiae had been elaborately described. Seldom, too, have we met anything more successful than the description of the progress of Ivo's destiny; his childhood—his love for Nazi the old herdsman—his innocent attachment to Emmerenz—his boyish life—his first studies—the Latin school—till at length the time comes for his entering the Seminary, or, as it is called in the volume before us, the Cloister, where his strictly professional education commences. There are whole chapters in this portion of the tale, which we would gladly transcribe if it were possible. Mother Christina's visit to the chaplain at Horb, preparatory to placing her boy at the Latin school, the preparations for his departure, the blue coat, providently made large enough to allow him to grow, the visit with which he is honoured by the sheriff's sons, who are his school-mates, and numberless other scenes of the same character, all described with a simplicity and at the same time an effect which are really captivating: We regret still more the necessity of passing over Ivo's leave-taking of his native village, when he is about to enter the ecclesiastical seminary, which though it want the exquisite tenderness, is, in some respects, little inferior to the same scenes in Carleton's "Poor Scholar." But we could not think of omitting the arrival of the party at the Seminary. It consists of Ivo, his mother, Nazi the old herdsman, and Bartel, a poor orphan who is also entering the Seminary, and whom they have good-naturedly brought with them in their humble vehicle.

"Our travellers put up at the Grapes, not far from the Cloister; but hardly had they seated themselves at table, when the bell tolled for vespers. Mistress Christina rose, and beckoned to the two lads, who went with her to the church.

"There is a deep power in the everywhere visibleness of the Catholic religion: whithersoever you wander, her temples stand open, the sanctuaries of your faith and hope; everywhere you see your fellow-creatures prostrate in devotion before the same sacred objects, and repeating the same words in prayer: you are everywhere among brethren, and children of the one holy and visible Father at Rome.

"Thus knelt Christina before the altar, with the two boys, absorbed in silent prayer: they were no longer conscious how far they were from home, for even here the hand of the Lord had erected a blessed home for the stranger. With a firm and fervent trust in God, Christina took her boy Ivo by one hand, and Bartel by the other, and went with them to the Cloister.

"Here there was a great bustle and running to and fro, and people were to be seen in various-coloured dresses, from all the Catholic parts of the country round about. When the usher at the door of the Cloister had examined and returned the certificates to Christina, all three were conducted to the presence of the Director. He was a gruff-looking old man, and to all that Christina said he merely replied, 'Very well, very well, all right.' The truth was that his attention had this day been unusually tried, and it was not to be wondered at that he was somewhat sparing in his words.

"Ivo twitched his mother's gown, and she now begged that 'his Reverence' would be pleased to allow her son to sleep this night at the inn. After a pause the Director said, 'Very well, but mind that early to-morrow morning, before church-time, he must be here.'

"As Bartel took leave of Mistress Christina, he poured out a volume of thanks; for the poor lad was so used to such expressions of gratitude, that the words were on his tongue's end: then he followed the usher to his chamber. Ivo jumped for joy at the thought of remaining a little longer with his mother, and they chatted together till late into the night.

"The sun shone forth brightly the next morning. Full an hour before church-time, Ivo, taking his mother's hand, went to the Cloister, while Nazi followed behind, carrying the luggage and Bartel's bundle. Mistress Christina now helped Ivo to put his clothes into the cupboard, which was cleared to receive them, and counted out all the things; but every now and then she turned round, with a troubled look, for she saw that no less than twelve boys were to sleep in the same chamber.

"When the bell of the Cloister church tolled, the mother and son parted, for Ivo had now to join his companions. As soon as the service was ended, Christina went to the good woman who had charge of the larder, a pleasant, conversable dame, and endeavoured to make friends with her, begging her to give Ivo a snack between the regular hours of meals, as the boy was delicate, adding that she would gladly pay for all.

"Ivo got permission to go with his mother to the inn for a short time before dinner; and here again she enjoined the landlady always to give her boy whatever he wanted, and to put it all down punctually in the bill, which should be paid to a farthing. The officious hostess was lavish of her promises, although she knew well enough that it was not in her power to do anything for the lad.

"At dinner Ivo ate with a good appetite; he knew indeed that his mother was not far from him. But afterwards he returned to the inn with a heavy heart, for now came the saddest parting. He went first into the stable, to Nazi, who was just harnessing the horse.

"'Nazi,' said he, 'you won't forget me?'

"No, no, you may trust me for that, as sure as the Bible," answered Nazi, pushing the collar over the horse's neck; he did not look round, for he wished to hide his emotion.

"And give my love to all the good people who ask for me."

"Ay, ay,—only don't grieve so at being away from home; there is a pleasure in going away, when we think that we leave behind those who love us, and that we have done no one any wrong."

"Nazi's voice faltered and he felt choked, but Ivo did not remark it, for he continued: 'And the pigeons too, you will not give them away till I come back?'

"Not a feather of them! But now go indoors to your mother; 'tis time for us to be starting, or to-morrow will slip away before we reach home; only do be happy and cheerful, and don't take it to heart so; Ehingen is n't out of the world, you know.—Hip, old horse!"

"So saying he led the horse to the cart, and Ivo went to look for his mother. Poor Christina was weeping bitterly; as soon as Ivo saw her, he repressed his own grief, exclaiming, 'Do not cry so, mother: Ehingen is not out of the world, you know; and at Easter I shall come home again, and then we'll all be merry together, won't we?'

"His mother pressed her lips close together with pain: then she stooped and put her arms round Ivo's neck, and kissed him again and again, saying, 'Be good and pious, Ivo!' These were the last words she sobbed out; then she got into the cart; the horse looked round, as if to take a last leave of Ivo, Nazi nodded again, the cart drove off, and they were soon out of sight.

"Ivo stood there awhile, with his hands folded, and hanging down his head. When he raised his eyes again, filled with tears, his mother and Nazi were gone. A sudden impulse seized him: he darted through the street after the cart, and presently saw it at a distance hastening along the road. For some minutes he stood fixed to the spot, watching it, and then with a deep sigh he returned to the town. There, every one was happy, and at home,—he alone was a stranger, and unhappy.

"Meanwhile his mother, seated in the cart, took her 'Nuster'* in her hand, and repeated a prayer: 'Dear and holy Mother of God! thou knowest what a mother's love is, thou hast felt it in sorrow and in joy. Protect my child, my precious boy! and if I sin in loving him so much, let me suffer for the fault, and not him.'"—pp. 251-256.

The "cloister life" of Ivo, that part at least which can properly be called such, we mean the detail of his professional pursuits, his spiritual exercises, and that quiet

* From *Pater Noster*—rosary.

but elevating and chastening routine of religious observances, which forms the especial training of a young ecclesiastic, is passed hastily over, and indeed is hardly alluded to even in passing. In the practical tendency of the tale, we regard this as a serious defect; and even in an artistic point of view, it destroys the reality and consistency of the narrative. But in truth the author appears to have proposed to himself but one object, a picture of the working of the natural feelings and affections under such circumstances as those in which his hero is placed. And in this picture we must allow him to have succeeded almost to perfection. Ivo's longings after his father's house, his holidays at home, the visit of his humble friend Nazi to the college, his college friendships, are all true to nature in their smallest details. The only blot upon this portion of the tale, is the character of his friend Clemens, a painful and unnatural conception, which is made more disagreeable by the contrast with the simplicity and good taste of all the rest of the book.

From the Seminary, Ivo is transferred to the University, and this with the exception of the closing scenes, is by far the least interestingly managed portion of the tale. But even this portion is not without an occasional touch of truth and nature. Scenes like the following have been frequently described, but we think Auerbach's description will not suffer by comparison with any of the rest.

"One day a messenger came in haste from Nordstetten, bringing a letter from the Bailiff to the Director, which conveyed a request that Ivo might have leave of absence to return home for a few days, as his mother had to undergo a painful surgical operation, and earnestly wished to see him. Full of anxiety Ivo hastened home with the messenger, from whom he heard that his mother had some time before fallen down stairs and broken her arm; that she had neglected it, and in consequence was now obliged to undergo an operation to save her life: for her children's sake alone would she consent to suffer this: to them her life was precious. It went to Ivo's soul to hear the messenger continually speak of his mother as if she were already dead, or at all events could never 'get over it;' and he always ended by saying, 'Ay, she was the honestest woman to be found far or near.'*

"The meeting of mother and son was very affecting, and Christina said, 'My boy, I can bear it all better now that you are here.'

* [I must give the characteristic German expression—*so weit man kocht*.—TRANSL.]

"The next day came the surgeon; he wished that the good woman's eyes should be bandaged; but she said, 'No, wheel the bed into the middle of the room, so that I can see the crucifix, and you shall see that I will not flinch nor utter a sound.' After some remonstrance her wish was complied with. In one hand was her rosary, and with the other she held firmly her son's hand; her eye was fixed intently on the cross, and she exclaimed, 'Thou blessed Saviour, who hast patiently bore the greatest sufferings, strengthen me, keep me firm if I tremble. And whatever pains I have to bear, I will think of thee, O thou blessed mother of God! and suffer all in silence. Pray with me, Ivo.'

"Without a groan she underwent the operation. Whilst the bystanders wept aloud, and Valentine, half fainting, was led into the next room, there lay Christina silent and motionless; her lips alone moved, her eye was fixed upon the crucifix, and a peaceful and holy expression beamed upon her countenance.

"All was now ended, and the surgeon himself could not help praising the heroic fortitude of his patient. Christina sank back upon the pillow, and tranquilly closed her eyes. Valentine, who had re-entered the chamber, bent over his wife and gazed on her: then heaving a deep sigh he exclaimed, 'God be praised!' Ivo knelt down beside the bed; he looked at his mother, and prayed fervently. All present clasped their hands in silence, and it was as if the living Spirit of God penetrated every heart.

"When Christina awoke, she cried, 'Valentine!' He hastened to her side, seized her hand, pressed it to his heart and wept. 'Wife!' said he at length, 'will you forgive me? you shall never hear an unkind word from me again; I am unworthy of you,—I see it all; and if the Lord had taken you from me, I should have gone mad.'

"'Nay, nay, do not say so, Valentine, I have no cause to forgive you. I know how good you are, although you are sometimes not yourself: but do not fret, Valentine! all will be well again; the Lord only willed to try us.'—pp. 353-356.

But though we could linger long with pleasure over these charming sketches, we must hasten to the close. This visit to his home convinces Ivo that he has mistaken his heart in conceiving that its tendency was towards the sacred ministry; and that, though his piety is still as fervent, and his principles as pure as when, in the fervour of his early boyhood, he devoted himself to the service of the altar, yet his real calling is to the active and laborious life of the peasant of his native forest. The announcement of this change of purpose is received very differently by his two parents. The father storms and threatens, the mother weeps and remonstrates gently; and poor Ivo,

yielding to the gentler influence what he would have indignantly denied to the violence against which he revolted, returns to the University, resolved to combat and, if possible, to overcome, the impulses which withdraw him from the life for which he had been so long designed.

Meanwhile, however, the scrupulous fears of his mother are alarmed, and she is smitten with terror lest her remonstrance and entreaty should have the effect of making Ivo enter the University, unwilling and unprepared, solely in deference to her wishes. She resolves on withdrawing the influence which she had exerted, and with the assistance of Emmerenz, who is now her servant or rather her companion and assistant, sets about a letter conveying her wishes on the subject. The task, however, proves too delicate and too difficult for the unpractised and unready though willing scribe; and as a last resource, Emmerenz offers to be herself the bearer of Christina's message to her son.

We cannot resist the temptation of adding this one further extract.

"Emmerenz took her place at the table, trimmed the wick of the lamp with a pin, arranged all the things neatly before her, and said, 'Now then, tell me what to write.'

"Mistress Christina sat behind the table, in the corner under the crucifix, and tried first to peel another potato, as she said, 'Write, dear Ivo,—have you written that?'

"'Yes.'

"'I am always thinking of you: not an hour of the day passes, nor in the night, when I am in bed and awake, that my thoughts are not with you, dearest Ivo!'

"'Not so fast, or I can't follow you,' said Emmerenz. She raised her face, which was as red as scarlet, looked at the lamp, and paused for a minute, biting the end of her pen; *she* too would have written the very same words to Ivo: then putting her face close to the paper, she wrote, and said when she had finished, 'dearest Ivo—go on.'

"'No, first read me what you have written.'

"Emmerenz read.

"'Yes, that's right; now go on writing; I don't feel easy at your having so suddenly changed your mind:—stop, don't write that yet—we must not begin so.'

"Emmerenz rested her chin upon her hand, awaiting further instructions; but Christina said, 'There, you have heard now what I wish to tell him, so do you write it all; that's the way the Schoolmaster does.'

"'I'll tell you what,' said Emmerenz, jumping up from her chair; 'a letter might fall into wrong hands, or be lost, and moreover we don't understand properly how to put it on paper; the best thing will be for me to go to Ivo and tell him all. To-morrow is Sunday, and I shall neglect no work; I've cut the hay, and will give it to the cattle over-night, and for one day my sister can look after things: the potatoes are peeled, and I shall leave all in readiness, so that you'll merely have to put the meat to the fire. By the valley 'tis only a walk of seven hours to Tübingen, and I'll run like a hare; Sunday, you know, is a long day, and to-morrow evening I shall be back in good time.'

"'Will you go all alone, and in the night too?'

"'Alone! is not our heavenly Father present everywhere? He will stretch his hand over a poor girl to protect her,' added Emmerenz. 'And I *must* go in the night, or else you know I should not get back to-morrow, and then *he* would make a row.'

"'Well, I cannot say no,—it seems as if it must be so. Go then in God's name! Here, take my Nuster (rosary); there is a little piece of cedar in it from Mount Lebanon, which belonged to my great-great-grandmother—that will protect you.' She took down her rosary, which hung on the door-post, over the little basin containing the holy water, reached it to Emmerenz, and continued: 'Don't walk too fast, and if you are tired, do not return till the day after to-morrow,—that's quite soon enough. And I have just a sixpenny-piece in my pocket, which I'll give you.' Then opening the table-drawer, she took out a loaf of bread, saying, 'Here, take this with you; bread out of the drawer brings a blessing. But what shall I say to the folks when they ask for you? I cannot tell an untruth.'

"'Oh, say that I had something very particular to do; folks need not know everything; only I must manage to get off before *he* comes home.'

"'With astonishing agility Emmerenz ran up stairs and down stairs, and got every thing in readiness, as she had said; then she went to her chamber, to dress herself in her Sunday's best. Christina helped her, and when the maiden drew out her prettiest boddice from the chest, something wrapped up in paper fell jingling on the floor.

"'What's that?' asked Christina.

"'Oh, 'tis only a little bit of glass, which Ivo once gave me, when we were very little children,' said the maiden, hastily hiding the treasure again.

"'When Emmerenz was drest, Christina said, tying and untying her apron-string all the while, 'I don't know after all that it is right for you to go: had you not better stay here?'

"'Stay here! ten horses should not keep me; don't be so wavering; you have promised to let me go, and this would be the first time you had gone from your word.'

"Emmerenz went back into the sitting-room, dipped her finger in the holy water at the door, and crossed herself; she then set out upon her journey. Christina followed her to the door, and again tried to dissuade her from going, but with a hasty 'God bless you!' Emmerenz tripped off. Christina's eyes followed her, as she crossed the garden to the fields, and her blessing accompanied the maiden.

"Emmerenz chose this path, in order to avoid meeting any of the villagers. As she passed through the Home-close, the moon was hidden behind a large cloud, and on entering the dark forest, to go down to the Neckar, she shuddered a little: all was silent and pitch-dark: she looked round, fancying that she heard footsteps behind her, but it was only the noise of her own steps; and laughing at her fears, she skipped boldly over the roots which lay twisted across the narrow path. Emmerenz had been well-instructed, and she no longer believed in ghosts and spirits; nevertheless she had still firm faith in the Mockle-Peter; how indeed could she help it, when so many people had actually felt him squatting upon their backs? and every now and then she lifted up her shoulder, to assure herself that the elf was not perched on it. She believed too in the little Nix, which rolls before the traveller's feet in the shape of a wild cat or a log of wood; so that when he goes to sit down upon it, he sinks into the wet mud. Emmerenz held the rosary firmly twisted round her hand.

"On reaching the open glade in the wood, where the noble beech-tree stands, with an image of the Virgin fixed to its smooth trunk, Emmerenz knelt down, took the rosary in her clasped hands, and prayed fervently. The moon shone forth from the clouds, full and clear, and the maiden rose strengthened in heart, and pursued her journey. Her path now followed the course of the Neckar: on both sides dark pine-forests stretched up to the very summit of the hills: the valley was for some distance so narrow, that there was only space for a strip of meadow, the river and the road. All lay in silent repose; only at times a bird chirped, roused from its sleep, as if to say, 'Ah, how comfortable it is here in the nest!' the dogs barked, when Emmerenz passed the lonely farm-yards, the water-mills clattered busily, and the maiden's heart beat quick.

"Emmerenz had never been more than two hours' walk from home, and many thoughts now came into her mind: she contrasted the scene around with her own village, and involuntarily exclaimed, 'How different! that lies on the hill-side, and has fields as fat as bacon.' She only wished that the Neckar could be carried over the hill, that there might not be such a want of water.

"The stars glittered brightly, and looking up, Emmerenz said to herself, 'How wonderful it is to see so many millions of stars sparkling above there, like so many little lights in a large sooty frying-pan, only far, far more beautiful and holy! And to think

that God sits up above there, and keeps watch over all the world! How many beautiful things one loses in the year by sleeping! and if a man does not look sharply about him, he sees little even when his eyes are open. Yes, *he* was right, I observe things much better now, and there is a great pleasure in it.' At this instant a falling-star caught her eye; Emmerenz raised her hands and exclaimed, 'Ivo!' She stood still, and looked abashed upon the ground; she had betrayed the deepest wish of her heart; for, as is well known, whatever any one wishes at the moment a star falls is sure to come to pass.

"Emmerenz hastened on her way, and as she passed a little water-mill she thought, 'Ah now, if I had but such a mill as that yonder, I'd work like a horse. What a fine thing it must be to look at such a pretty little property and be able to call it mine! Well-a-day! I should like to know whom he would marry, if he were not to be a priest. Heaven is my witness, I would run for him just as readily if he took another—*quite* as readily? no, perhaps not *quite*, but yet with heart and good-will. He is perfectly right to wish not to be a priest. Oh, what a misery it must be to have nobody in the world to love, and to belong to nobody! If God had willed that a man should not marry, He would have made only men, and have let people grow on the trees: but these are wicked thoughts,' she added; and ending her soliloquy, she quickened her steps, as if trying to escape from her own thoughts. With an effort of the will she turned her attention to the objects and scenes around her, and as she listened to the rushing sound of the river, she thought, 'What a wonderful thing is such a stream, running on and on for ever! ay, little river, you would like, I suppose, to keep on your course for mere sport, and do no work! but no, you must bear the rafts and drive the mills: all and everything in the world must work, and it is right that it should be so. Yes, that is another cause of grief to him (she meant Ivo); he would like to work, and not to be tied down only to preach and perform mass, and read in those big books; there's no real work in all that. I shall tell him all about it, but I must not let him think that I speak for myself.'

"The day at length dawned, and Emmerenz felt her heart lightened: she went down to the river, washed her face and smoothed her hair. She stood dreamingly for awhile looking at her own figure reflected in the river; her eyes were fixed upon the water, but she saw nothing: it seemed as if a thought had transported her gaze from the scene around, to fix it vividly upon some object present to her mind. As Emmerenz proceeded, she kept looking about her in astonishment; she felt strange at being alone at sunrise on a spot where she knew no one and nobody knew anything of her. Although indeed she felt the effects of her long walk, she could almost fancy herself suddenly transported hither by magic.

"It was a beautiful August morning, the larks warbled blithely in the air, and the blackbirds' notes were heard in the wood: but all this made no impression upon Emmerenz; she was accustomed to such sounds and scenes, and she tripped along singing a little song to herself.

"In Rottenburg Emmerenz rested awhile, after which she pursued her way with fresh strength and courage. When she came in sight of Tübingen, the difficulty first occurred to her, how she should contrive to see Ivo at the College: by good luck however she recollected that Christina's daughter Lisbeth was in service in the family of an attorney; and a lawyer's servant, thought she, will surely be able to give advice, for all the folks go to her master when they are in trouble. After many inquiries she found Lisbeth, who at first did not know what to advise; but turning the matter over in her mind, she at length said, 'I'll tell you what: stay here for an hour, till the bell tolls; then go and seat yourself in the church, in front on the left hand; you'll see Ivo up in the gallery, and can make him a sign to meet you after service.'

"'In the church!' exclaimed Emmerenz, clasping her hands: 'good heavens! you are dreadfully corrupted in the town: no, I'd rather go back without seeing him at all.'

"'Well then help yourself as you can, since you're so very particular.'

"'So I will,' said Emmerenz, turning away. She now went straight to the college, was announced to the Director, and said in a simple and artless manner that she wished to speak with Ivo.

"'Are you his sister?' asked the Director.

"'No, I am only the servant-maid in the house.'

"The Director looked steadfastly in Emmerenz' face; but she returned his gaze with a look of truth and frankness, and her features were unmoved. The Director ordered the servant to lead her to Ivo."—pp. 372-381.

We have no fear that this extract, though unreasonably long, will be considered tedious. It is poetry and truth itself.

It is hardly necessary to tell the end of the tale. Ivo leaves the university, abandons the profession for which he had at length discovered his unfitness, and, through the generous friendship of his old companion and instructor Nazi, (now grown a rich and prosperous man), he is reconciled to his father, established independently in life, and marries Emmerenz, who had loved him from her very childhood, and under the strong sense of duty and of religion had silently striven against and overcome this misplaced, as she believed, and unrequited affection. Her silent and unrepining struggle, indeed, is described with a

degree of delicacy and feeling, second only to those exhibited in the more elaborate sketch of Ivo.

We have already alluded to the character of Ivo's college friend, Clemens, as a serious defect in the tale. He is represented as a compound of weakness and fanaticism, amiable and affectionate it is true, but the creature of his impulses and feelings, destitute of any higher or holier principle whereby to regulate or control them; utterly unconscious of the true spirit of his exalted calling, and actuated by no loftier or more ennobling motives in pursuing it than are supplied by his own unreflecting and unregulated enthusiasm. The painful impression created by the introduction of this ill-sustained conception would, perhaps, have been obviated by the presentation, as a sort of set-off, of one or two characters which might be fairly taken as representatives of the true spirit of the young ecclesiastic. But the only other students to whom we are introduced, or at least of whom we learn anything in detail, are Constantine, a wild, unruly, and malicious youth, pining to be released from the bondage to which the strong will of his parents alone has consigned him, and Bartel, a poor and unfriended orphan, the happiness of whose student-life consists in his being well-fed and comfortable, a luxury which he had never enjoyed before, and whose prospective happiness in the ministry and aspirings towards its attainment hardly reach beyond the perpetuation of these creature comforts on a larger and less constrained scale.

These, we need hardly say, are grave defects, and though we do not discover in the work any evidence that such a result was contemplated or intended, they have the effect of marring to a great extent its moral tendency as a tale of real life, and of representing the preparatory studies of a young ecclesiastic as a series of cold formalities and harsh and unnatural restrictions, devised for the purpose of subduing the will, and breaking down the spirit and the self-reliance of the youthful candidates for orders. We need hardly say, that in drawing such a picture the author has not only violated the realities of the student-life, notoriously the happiest and most joyous in the career of the ecclesiastic, but has also sacrificed much in artistic effect, by shrinking from a fair delineation of the varieties of character which are always found thrown together in an ecclesiastical college, and which would furnish ample

scope for a pencil ordinarily so truthful and so felicitous as Auerbach's.

In conclusion we must, even with these drawbacks, repeat our thanks to Mrs. Taylor for the service she has rendered in translating these pretty tales. We have not heard whether she purposes to continue her task, and to translate the remaining stories of the collection. Of the two contained in the second volume, there is one—"Florian and Crescenz"—which, we trust, she will not think of translating into English. It is a coarse, pointless, and extravagant tale, especially ill-suited to a female pen, and in every way unworthy of Auerbach's former fame. The second, "Der Lauterbacher," though inferior in simplicity to the earlier sketches, and possessing more of what we used to call the *German character*, is yet in many respects a pleasing and instructive tale; and one which, with a few such judicious retrenchments as Mrs. Taylor has made in her present volume, would form an agreeable addition to our English collection of "Village Tales from the Black Forest."

ART. V.—1. *Third Report on Emigration from the United Kingdom.*

Printed by order of the House of Commons, 29th of June, 1827.

2.—*Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth General Reports of the Colonial Land Emigration Commissioner, 1844-5-6.*

WE sit down to write with a map on our table, which, under the technical name of "Mercators's projection," places this round world before us in the form of a plane. In casting our eye over its surface, it lights at length on a small speck in the eastern hemisphere of earth, scarcely visible, but so important in the views of its constructor, that he had written over it the words "British Isles" in characters so large that they nearly obscure the isles themselves.

Looking towards the east we found vast possessions, illimitable in extent, curious in language, and as yet unsubdued in feeling and in habits—possessions originally gained and kept by British merchants, now an important

portion of her empire. Again viewing this small epitome of earth, we found a vast continent peopled by these tiny isles, to whom they had given language, and into the bosoms of whose inhabitants they had helped to infuse the blessings of civil liberty and of christian love.

But this was not all. We looked to the south, and found a land which men dreamed not to have existence a few centuries ago—whose very islands are continents, and her continent still an unexplored world! Yet this land was discovered by men who owed their parentage to Britain, originally peopled by the very refuse of her population, now regulated by her laws, and, let us hope, directed by her religion.

And all these are the progeny of that small mother before named—of that little great thing called Britain, before whom nations have bowed, and kings been prostrate. Never, when Roman legions swayed the earth, or the merchant flag of sea-born Venice floated over the seas, did history display a parallel.

Nor is the picture less curious when we look at home. Mark her surface, studded with its temples and its palaces; her people, revelling in the spoils of earth, which, from the palace to the cottage, have by long habit converted the *luxuries* of other times into the *wants* of life. Look at her towns—the metropolis alone, gorged with two millions of breathing creatures; think of Manchester, and Birmingham, and Glasgow, and Liverpool, and a hundred others, one and all the teeming haunts of busy men, who, by unceasing toil are either creating or receiving the things which minister to splendour or to comfort, or sending them forth over the surface of this broad world.

But without our aid we presume that Britain's pre-eminence will be at once admitted, simply as a fact. Yet, as effects are at all times the result of anterior causes, let us in this instance endeavour to suggest some ideas which may account for the curious anomaly that a few small islands should have become little else than the masters of the world. It is not sufficient to say that she is the empress of the seas, and has thus commanded the commerce of the entire globe. Shall we then, in explaining it, look upon her surface? Her fields, 'tis true, are broad, and their luxuriance great; her cattle traverse a thousand hills; and the very oaks on which her navies float are largely furnished forth by her own productive soil. But

the great truth—a truth long known to the wise, but as long combatted—now begins to be acknowledged by all nations, by us especially. Such truth should be written in golden letters in every market-place, emblazoned on the sails of every merchant-ship.

This truth is one as simple as it is comprehensive. It is this: That the world's Creator meant *the superfluities of one land to supply the deficiencies of another*. It is an axiom which tells throughout, the very definition of the word, commerce; it pervades nations in their reciprocal relations, it applies to individuals in each of them. China sends her tea, simply because she has an excess over her own consumption; Brazil will (if we only permit it) send her sugar for the same reason; and tallows from the Baltic supply us with ten thousand lights. If we look to places nearer home, what do we perceive? Since a wise minister, some few years ago, partially broke the bonds with which commerce had been fettered, eatables of all sorts flow unto us from many European ports, and luxuries are not wanting. It would require a good statistician to say how far this may have tended to mitigate the evils of a proverbially unhappy year.

This position, which we have endeavoured to define, is now practically centered in the words "Free Trade," which apply with equal force to domestic as international commerce. Let us dive deeper into the foundations of national greatness or individual existence, all result from the labour of men; the doom was written, "in the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat bread:" it is before us fulfilled to the letter—the mechanic fills the coffers of his master, and tenants shower in wealth upon their lord. But, take it as we will, all is founded upon labour; all want gold, and it is better to have it by the free exercise of mutual relation than by its acquisition *as gold*. One marked instance of this is now afforded by a European nation. At one time she got gold and silver almost for the taking; she has since learnt (or should have learnt) that the ready acquisition of it at once paralyzed her people, degenerated her nobles, and, though possessing at home the most productive country in Europe, Spain has long been not only the victim of civil strife, but a borrower of money from her neighbours. Such things depend on the possession of wealth—nominal wealth—readily got when gold is readily got, readily parted

with when *it* is readily acquired ; but bearing a stamp of double value when acquired by *productive labour*. Were we able to dive into the mysteries of the London Stock Exchange, such truths would doubtless be amply verified.

According to the principles already alluded to, nations reciprocally derive wealth by the interchange of things produced in excess. In many instances this excess consists in crude commodities, the offspring of the soil, or in gold or gems wrung from its bowels.

* But in no way does this apply to Britain. Gold she has within herself none, no diamonds sparkle in her mines, no ruby glitters on her rocks ; yet she has them all—she luxuriates in wines she never made, in sugar whose canes she never grew. If you could draw a wall around her, shutting in her swarming millions, they must die, for in herself she produces nothing like the *nutriment* required, independent of luxuries ; and yet she has even them in abundance.

If we dive deeper into the mystery however we shall still find, that Britain *has* an excess of production in two marked examples, coal and iron. She could supply half Europe with each, did this suit her purpose. But she has long and wisely applied them to more useful purposes.

The law of excess is not invalidated because it acts indirectly—we believe this proposition will be amply verified if we cast our eye around us.

How happened it that Manchester, and Glasgow, and Sheffield, and fifty other cities, sprung into being, some of them almost yesterday ? The answer is a clear one ;—They were made by coal and iron. We question not the energy and skill of men who have advantaged themselves by the possession, but we do hold that such energies and such skill are the result of those things once dormant in the earth. Iron furnishes her engines, coal stimulates them into action, and her masters and mechanics live on their produce. By these she weaves the silk she never formed, and spins the cotton of the East and West ; largely clothing the very people who produced them. By these her steamers fret the waters of earth, or her ships traverse the ocean on its surface. By these, in fact, she has been enabled to conquer kingdoms and plant colonies which at once invest her with all the attributes of power, and conduce to the extension and maintenance of her commerce.

But we must now revert to the dry but important and practical details which head our Article.

Practical and important all will at once admit them,—*how* important many at present do not consider. They involve a question of national importance, a question which unless speedily and rightly solved, may cause misery to a dozen generations. Times are ominous, and history reads us fearful lessons. One we had in a sister kingdom, written in bloody letters, whose red stains are yet scarcely dry. Had men's stomachs nothing to do with this? *We* think they had. When the haughty Coriolanus bearded Rome's mechanics in a tumult, their answer was, "that hunger broke stone walls—that dogs must eat."

Let Britain well consider this: she now harbours thousands whose daily bread is next to nothing—patient endurance will not last for ever. We hope and believe that Britain will yet triumph over all her difficulties; but she must do so by taking an expanded view of her own real position. She must not listen to Protectionists at Agricultural dinners, or to manufacturing Croesuses who attempt to show that they and their class are alone correct: the first must lay aside the lingering relics of feudal pretension; the second must consider that their wealth is somewhat the result it is true of their own activity, but always founded on the toil of their less successful neighbours. Without such amalgamation of feeling, we despair of Britain.

At this time much is doing to cement that union; the endeavour now making to induce us as a Body Politic, to found an education for the lower orders on some consistent principle, supported by the national purse; the attention paid to the physical purification of large cities by drainage and sewerage; and the Act (imperfect as it is) which, at all events, regulates future building in a wiser manner than before. All such are at least movements in the right direction, the political oasis of a desert waste, and in them we may happily read the Signs of the Times as regards our Empire.

But it is a curious fact, that the majority of these obviously useful changes have not originated with the governing powers, whoever they were. They have been invariably forced on the attention of the legislative body by private individuals. It has for centuries been the grand error of

the aristocracy of this land, that they considered not their true position; in older days they fought Catholic Emancipation all but to the death, and then yielded. In later ones they did the same by Reform of Parliament, and now the royal ink is scarcely dry on an act, which opposed by a tenacity worthy of a better cause, is unquestionably destined to at least ameliorate the condition of the poor. One and all of these mighty changes were unhappily induced by means little honourable to either the intelligence or the humanity of Britain's privileged classes; but that such should have been brought about by peaceful means is an honour to the nation, and amply demonstrates on what a substantial basis of intellectual and moral power her greatness rests.

But with all the advantages which have resulted, or may result, from either the effected or prospective changes already named, there still remains a mighty problem to solve. Whatever increase may occur in the quantity or decrease in the cost of human food through these means, there will still remain millions, who from the contingencies to which commerce and manufacture are liable, must frequently be exposed to all the miseries which even the temporary absence of work implies; and when we add to this the enormous annual increase in population, it seems from such considerations that the nation ought no longer to trust to those great advantages likely to result from the new commercial era which has dawned, but aid them by diminishing with comfort to themselves, a population which she cannot feed at home. Were it fitting to look on men as commodities for exportation, we might fairly place Britain's surplus population in the same category with her Coal and Iron. She possesses an excess of labour created by herself, she possesses colonies which only want labour and good government, to stimulate them into a strong and civilized existence.

It is obvious that these remarks point to the question of emigration, a principle to which many object more from feeling than from judgment. There seems a something dreadful in the word *expatriation*, but surely nothing but a mawkish sensibility could wish a man to remain at home and starve, if he could transfer him to lands sometimes within a fortnight's sail, swayed by his own government, protected by his own laws, and already largely inhabited by his own people. If, indeed, expatriation were the sole

objection, we might admire the feeling however we dissented from its influence; but when we consider the thousands even of the better orders, who under the lure of gold, voluntarily adopt every year, and when among the lower we find an army recruited by unnumbered men, who take the chance of every climate and every vicissitude, we conclude that there are millions in this and our neighbouring island, who if equally encouraged by the rulers, would willingly grasp the plough-share instead of the musket; there are ample bold hearts and strong arms in this land for both purposes, the difference is, that the one portion has been brought into action by the warlike necessities of the country, while the other has not received that encouragement which might have made them the tillers of Britain's soil in other lands, without encountering the extreme difficulties which besets those whom choice or necessity has already compelled to abandon home, with little but a stout heart to bear the transfer.

To blame the governing powers entirely for this, would perhaps be wrong; the very pecuniary difficulties of each successive administration, may have had much to do in preventing an extended view of this momentous question. Besides this, too, it has been in this country a leading maxim that all commercial or speculative enterprises should be apart from the State; nor has it been until some few such grew into a magnitude which rendered them objects of national importance, or sunk into ruin which threatened the very commercial existence of the kingdom, that Government has ever interfered. The East India Company, and the South Sea scheme, form marked but strangely contrasted examples of this fact.

Within certain limits we do not think this principle a wrong one. But the wants and circumstances of a people change, and we consider that the time has now arrived, when it becomes the duty of Government not only to interfere to regulate the proceedings of private parties, and public companies, but even in some cases to undertake on national responsibility and support on national credit, this most important question now forced on public attention, we mean, of course, Emigration.

To such sentiments, it might be answered, that Government has already done something. We will give them their due merit—they have passed an Act, (often infringed) "The Passenger's Act," which means to curb the avarice

of private speculation, and transmit men with greater comfort to their destined home. It has sold land—in Australia and other Colonies, to persons capable of purchase—at a high rate, so high that many have been damaged by the purchase; and it has appointed a Board of Commissioners. But in no one instance of which we know, has England, as a nation, ever given her attention to locate in her own possessions, in something like comfort, the very class who are the best emigrants, we mean those who without aid cannot emigrate, who without preliminary arrangements in the Colonies must, for a time at least, be miserable. Men, always with hands, often with acute heads—men, who would thankfully receive the boon conferred and some day repay it with interest, but who are too frequently deceived by private cupidity, and—we must say it—the indifference of the Government which permits it.

The proofs of these sentiments might be collected from a thousand sources, for, we believe, that scarcely a private emigrant ship passes through the Channel where they could not be read; but we shall here content ourselves with two alone.

About three years ago, an Emigration Company, whose field of operation was our North American possessions, appeared before the public in a flaming prospectus. Its capital was half a million, for its president it had a duke, for its vice-presidents, three marquises, three earls, and five lords, in all eleven. It had a most magnificent array of council; a queen's council here at home, and one attorney general and one solicitor general for the Colonies, grace the prospectus. This noble duke, these noble lords, entrusted the whole concern to, what they called, a "Board of Commissioners;" but the real management, or, what we ought to call mismanagement, dwindled into the hands of a registrar and secretary. In point of fact, these nominally high persons who had lent themselves to a project, useful, nay admirable, in itself, never appear to have taken the slightest trouble to carry out their own intentions. They permit their names to be paraded on a printed document, whence "social," "moral," and "political" results are unavoidably to spring—but they never *pay* a shilling! To make a long story short; the Company, without a sixpence in its coffers, and small chance of getting one, had the cruelty to embark many men and

their families, at an intemperate season, for a locality where they would have found nothing but starving misery awaiting them.

The story of this part of the melancholy transaction may be found written in the annals of the Mansion House, for 1843. The "Barbadoes," a well found, well provisioned brig, spread her sails late in that year. She buffeted the gales for long, but was compelled to return. The catastrophe was somewhat dramatic—the Company of Lords ruined the man on whose credit the vessel and provisions were supplied; she cast forth her miserable emigrants into London, with the loss of all their little savings; the bubble then burst! And the small body of Commissioners hastened from the splendid offices in which Lords had sat, fearful of the Sheriff.

The second example we have to record is different in its origin, but more disastrous in its result. It was an Association of the intended Emigrants themselves; the requisite funds were to be accumulated out of their savings, and its object was emigration to the Tropics. Its name, the "Tropical Emigration Society," seems to have sprung from the brains of two men bearing German names, who imbued the members with a sufficient amount of German philosophy and mysticism. Perfect equality of rights in every thing, were the leading principles, and its Secretary was a man who had been years ago in prison as a Chartist. These simple facts will sufficiently explain its nature, and yet, under the influence of that social misery which leads to despair, there were to our knowledge enlisted among its members, mechanics of minds so acute, and of habits so pure, that they would advantage any new country and be a loss to their own.

Having accumulated a certain sum of money, and acquired many members, it appears that last year the Society began to reduce theory to practice. The originator, a person named Etzler, with a few others, were dispatched to the State of Venezuela to purchase a location. After much time lost, and money expended, it was announced that an *earthly paradise* had at last been found on the shores of the Gulf of Paria.

So soon as the fact of purchase was reported to the Society at home, a ship sailed from London with a party of fifty-seven emigrants.

On arriving en route at Trinidad, they found that two

of their agents had returned there from the anticipated El Dorado, one in a dying state; and the founder of this miserable emigration had never even seen it.

Nothing appalled, most of the pioneers, &c., still ventured to take possession. There was, says the Governor of Trinidad's report, "No house or hut to shelter them,"—"the estate was very close to a swamp,"—"not only very unhealthy, but which at first sight must have appeared to be so, to any person possessing moderate judgment and information." The food provided was scanty and bad; they had no medical attendance, and no medicines, except a small box of Homoeopathic preparations. The report goes on to state, "that some of them died, and were buried, not only without any religious ceremony, but even without those humble, yet decent, preparations which must have been within reach of surviving companions." So much for the national benefits of a Socialist Emigration. Of the fifty-seven souls that arrived in this wretched swamp, thirteen died either there or soon after their return to Port Spain, and the place became abandoned.

Unhappy was it for the interests of humanity that news of these disasters did not reach England sooner. In March last, a second ship load of emigrants followed their predecessors; in number nearly 150. The result of all was, that on arriving at Port Spain, they found most of their leaders had either died or run away. A majority of the emigrants re-chartered the ship and betook themselves to New Orleans, with what success we know not. Others remained on the Island, hiring an estate for a year, and meanwhile, as individuals, doing the best they could.

We have cited these two remarkably contrasted cases, as a foundation of the argument we as yet intend to urge in favour of a more comprehensive and better conducted emigration than has hitherto been attempted. Both were schemes which, like all human undertakings, had their origin in self-interest, but the motives of action differed largely. The first chose, we admit, colonies well suited to the health and habits of Britons, and under the control of British laws. The second, deluded by glittering visions of soils teeming with luxuriant vegetation, adventured on an enterprize which the smallest acquaintance with its *real* nature would have prevented.

These two cases are, we think, sufficient to show, that emigration from this country demands an attention which

it has not as yet received. The question is indeed an extremely wide and complex one, but, in general terms, we must express our conviction that more stringent regulations in reference to the well-being of emigrants are imperatively called for.

It is not by selling government lands to rich companies or speculative millionaires, again to be doled forth in detail at high prices to future occupants; it is not by chartering large associations, and then by government interference producing turmoils, which natives cannot comprehend, and the power of the state can scarcely stay; it is not by such means that emigration can relieve or improve a nation. We want it on a larger scale, and conducted on improved moral principles.

The population of Great Britain in 1841, was	18,844,740
in 1831,	16,539,318

Increase in ten years,	2,305,422
------------------------	-----------

That of Ireland in 1841, was	8,175,238
in 1831,	7,767,401

Increase in ten years,	407,837
------------------------	---------

The results are, that the population of the United Empire has in the ten years between 1831 and 1841 been augmented to the extent of 2,713,259.

"It has," says the registrar general's report, "increased eleven per cent in ten years, or about one per cent per annum." So that, assuming the same increase to continue, the population will be doubled in about sixty-eight years.

"The births," he adds, "exceed the deaths by about 1056 daily, but emigration from the United Kingdom keeps down (!) the increase." As regards England he goes on to say, "that the daily births exceed the deaths by about 600," and "*gets rid*" of but a small portion of what has been ignorantly called its "superfluous population" by emigration. He talks further of the "English" emigrants being constantly replaced by the natives of Ireland and Scotland.*

The perfect truth of these statistical returns we do not

* Report of the Registrar General 1846, the seventh.

for a moment doubt. They must be correct; but there is a coldness pervading all such state documents which is not very exhilarating. What we would desire to see is, a state of affairs where no one country in the three associated nations was called on to replace the abstracted population of another. It is to the *United Empire* of small importance whether Scotchmen emigrate to England, or whether Irishmen do so; in any case it is a mere *home* transfer of population, the result of that suction force which the richer portion will always exert towards the poorer. But, taking the three nations as one—at least, a *nominal* whole—we maintain that neither their soil nor their commerce can afford sustenance, far less comfort, to their population; and therefore, however hard it may appear to recommend expatriation, it is now forced on men by the very necessities of the case, and should be met in a bold and comprehensive manner by such authorities as rule the state.

Let us then enquire how far this mode of providing for an exuberant population has been fostered by government, or to what extent it has been carried into action by private enterprise.

The grand total of emigration, according to the commissioner's report, was,

In 1841	„	118,592
1842	„	128,344
1843	„	57,212
1844	„	70,686
1845	„	93,500
		<hr/>
		468,334

giving thus an aggregate annual emigration, during these five years, of 93,667.

In the ten preceding years the average was still lower.

“In ten years,” says the Report of 1844, “from the year 1830 to 1840 inclusive, (omitting 1832, in which the emigration was 103,140,) the average amount of emigration was 65,692. The emigration therefore in 1841, was considerably above the ordinary average, whilst the emigration of last year was rather below it; by the most recent information, the emigration of the present year appears to be on the increase.”—p. 11, 1844.

It rose in fact to 70,686.

The causes of such fluctuations naturally attracted the

attention of the commissioners, especially how it was that 1842 should have exceeded 1843 by considerably more than a half. They consequently sought information from the naval agents at various shipping ports, and the answers are so illustrative of the vague system of emigration which now exists, that we are tempted to quote in full.

"We have endeavoured to ascertain the cause of the falling off in the emigration of the last as compared with the preceding year, and for this purpose we issued a circular to the naval agents at the principal ports, calling for any information they might possess on this subject. They attribute it mainly to the unfavourable reports which had been received of the demand for labour in the United States and in the North American Colonies, and to political excitement in Ireland. In addition to these, which are the principal causes assigned, some others are alluded to by a few of the officers as having contributed in a minor degree to the same result. That there has been a temporary cessation of the demand for labour in the United States and North American Provinces, is a fact which must be considered undisputed: all the reports from the governors to which we have had access agree on this point; and the agent at Liverpool states that numbers of emigrants who embarked in the spring of 1842, returned to England in the autumn in a worse condition than they went out, owing to the want of employment; and he remarks that the reports which they circulated would naturally deter others from running a similar risk. The other causes which are assigned as having more or less contributed to produce the reduction in the emigration of last year, would appear to be the result of local circumstances operating upon the condition of the labouring population; and although it would not be convenient to examine each statement in detail, we may mention some of them, viz. the improved demand for labour in the north of England, the prospects of railroads being formed in Ireland, and the circumstance that in parts of Scotland and Ireland the labouring population are stated to have been so much distressed at the end of 1842, that they could not obtain the necessary funds to defray the expense of their passage. In Scotland, several associations of the working classes had been formed with a view to emigration, but they had not succeeded in raising funds to any extent. We may further notice a statement of the agent at Londonderry, that those who emigrated in 1843, were either persons whose passages had been paid in America, or who had been advised to emigrate by friends that had preceded them, or else farmers who went out to take lands; a remark which is corroborative of the observations we have already made on the improved character of last year's emigration to Canada."

Nothing, we think, can more fully demonstrate the

inefficiency, as a national benefit, of emigration as it is now practised, than the statements contained in this one paragraph. It appears from it that even the remote prospect of home work by projects yet to be accomplished deters men from the undertaking. It shows that they rashly embark their little all to seek work in a land not British, and when from accidental causes such work is not at once found, they return worse off than when they sailed, a casualty to which emigrants must be ever liable until a better system prevails.

Besides this, it shows that numbers who wish to transfer themselves to other lands, are deterred by want of means to accomplish it; and thus the very social miseries, which alone render emigration desirable, become the cause of its nonaccomplishment. The commissioners congratulate themselves on the improved character of emigration to Canada during last year, meaning thereby that the average of farmers and small capitalists who transferred themselves had increased.

We are not disposed to take the same view of this question. That the introduction of capital into the colonies benefits *them*, we do not question; but it must be remembered that it in the same ratio damages the mother country by abstraction, and does not in any degree relieve her from that pressure which it ought to be the leading object of emigration to lessen.

The ideas of the existing government unfortunately do not appear to go along with us in this matter: but the extreme pressure thrown on the national resources to meet a great and imminent necessity, may fairly be assumed as a cause preventing its members for the time from entering on undertakings, which, though undoubtedly of far greater *ulterior* utility, would not be so immediate a relief.

The speech of Lord John Russell delivered on the 26th of January, when introducing the Irish measures is, on the subject of emigration, by no means encouraging.

We shall take the liberty of scanning the Premier's sentiments on this matter, not as the partisan critics of a measure, but in all good faith as involving a national question of great importance.

The noble Lord says,

"I confess, I think that, although Parliament may assist emigration to a certain extent, the extravagant expectations which are

entertained on this head can never possibly be fulfilled. (Hear, hear.) It is stated by Sir Robert Kane, and truly, that when persons are removed from a locality by emigration, the number removed is never so large as to produce a sensible effect on the population. I do not believe that any emigration which may take place, as the result of either private or public exertion can ever, according to the ordinary amount of emigration, produce such an effect as to enable the remaining population to earn a greater amount of wages."

This is about as cold, and calm a piece of political economy, as ever was promulgated by a minister. "Ordinary amount of emigration!" why it is the very thing objected to. Take the case as it stands, in round numbers the population of the empire in 1841 was about twenty-seven millions, and emigration has averaged under 100,000 a year; add to this, that by the Commissioner's reports, thousands are prevented by want of means, and further consider, that Ireland especially and Scotland also, are now not only distressed but actually in a state of famine, that the Exchequer of the empire is paying nearly £1,000,000 a month to prevent the death of thousands. Connect this with the fact, that we possess colonies to a great extent, uncleared, untilled, unoccupied, which only want the skill and industry of man for full development, and then tell us, reader, whether the minister is right, who states his conviction that nothing can be done more in emigration than what *has been done already*, would he not be wiser to devote some of the national funds to encourage a transfer which cannot long be avoided?

In the next objection which the Premier makes, there is doubtless more of reason, assuming the existing mode and amount of emigration to remain unchanged.

"Before we should make extraordinary efforts to increase emigration, it is necessary to consider an important point. If we attempt to go beyond that which is the ordinary annual emigration, and to convey a million of persons at once across the ocean, you must look not only to the advantage which you suppose would arise from not having those persons in Ireland competing with other labourers, but you must also inquire what funds—what means there are in the country to which they must be carried, to secure them subsistence. (Hear, hear.) If by the public means you convey a hundred thousand persons to the United States, that country would have just cause to complain of our having cast our paupers on her shores, to be maintained by her when their maintenance was a

primary obligation upon ourselves. Then, again, if we should attempt to introduce a hundred thousand emigrants into Canada, the market would be glutted by the redundant supply; and the labourers there, instead of obtaining a fair amount of the means of subsistence, as they did now, would enter into a fierce competition with each other, and thus a state of things would be produced in Nova Scotia and Canada, in some respects similar to that from which the emigrants had fled at home."

"The *ordinary* amount of emigration" is a favourite expression, as if the world was never to advance or even change; why it is like a man drawing a bucket full of water from the ocean, and thinking that by such abstraction he could modify its tides. Our previous numerical statements must render this at least clear. That it would be wrong for England to throw on the shores of the United States, a vast amount of emigrants without fitting provision being made is obvious enough. But why talk of the United States at all in the matter? nationally we have nothing to do with such a question. If men prefer going there and taking chances, it is well we cannot restrain them. But why should we throw these men on the United States? we possess splendid colonies of our own in their immediate vicinity, which afford the most ample means of location; colonies which if well settled and well regulated, might at once aid in relieving the emergency of their Mother Land, and should such unhappy necessity ever arise, protect her interests in future. Lord John Russell himself "confesses," that when he held the seals of the colonial department, he was disposed to go farther than he actually did, but was restrained by financial difficulties; he has lived to see the day, when nearly a million a month is scarcely sufficient to prevent the decimation of Ireland by *starvation*.

Supposing that the Government twenty years ago, had more clearly viewed the emigration question, would this have been the case? we doubt it much, especially as regards Ireland. It is going back a long time, but we would refer to a report of a committee of emigration in the year 1827.

The fourth section, headed, Remarks on a regulated system of emigration, &c., seems clearly drawn, laying down the rule that labour is the poor man's commodity, &c.

Under the fifth head this committee suggest "the

expediency of a pecuniary advance in nature of loan for the purpose of facilitating a regulated system of emigration."

Questions naturally occurred, as to the security the nation would have for payment of interest, and for the repayment of the capital. To illustrate their views, the committee states a "hypothetical case." It proposes a loan to emigrants during three years, (1828-1831.) amounting to £1,140,000. The interest of this charged on the consolidated fund at five per cent, is £57,000, which taken at the interest of £4. per cent, "will enable a sinking fund of £1. per cent, to liquidate a loan of £1,140,000."

The committee proposes that the labouring man should not be called upon to pay anything for three years, "he is then to pay in produce or money 10s., and each succeeding year an additional 10s., until the annual payment amounts to £5., when it remains stationary, and to be paid in money only." The settler has the power of redemption if he succeeds; the original cost of his location is £60, and should he not redeem, "the proposed scheme of annual payment would of course, (says the report,) redeem the original £60. in thirty years." The probability of repayment is mooted by the committee, and ten witnesses well acquainted with our North American possessions, agree generally in saying, that there would be no difficulty on the question; they strongly urge, that whereas the employment of capital by private individuals naturally requires an immediate return, the state can await it, but in either case they suggest, that the improved value of the land reclaimed and cleared, will in a few years form a more than ample security for the advance, and they prove this by adducing facts.

In 1823, a location was made in one of our North American possessions, of "120 heads of families." "In March 1826, their property amounted to £7662. 6s. 6d; and at the expiration of seven years from the time of their location, their capital might be expected to amount to £30,000."

The emigration of 1825 is still more striking. "It consisted of 2024, among whom were 415 heads of families, able-bodied and capable of labour." The emigrants were taken from Ireland, a part of it "in which there was no demand whatever for labour." These people were settled in Canada at an expense of "£43,145., including their location

and sustenance up to the period at which their first crops enabled them to provide for themselves." The actual produce of their *first* year's labour was £11,272. 8s. This was reported twenty years ago, and we now know its results; while Ireland is at this moment partly fed by Britain, the worthy sons she already sent forth on this wide world, are now repaying it not in feeling only but in coin. The savings banks, despite her present miseries, are loaded with deposits; much of this money comes from men who made it by a transfer from penury to ease, and whose good feelings prompt them to send the excess home, to aid relatives and friends in the same endeavour.

We request the Government not only to ponder well these facts, but to deduce from them the lesson we desire to teach.

If time and space permitted, we had a desire to go more deeply into this very important subject, but they do not, and we must speedily conclude.

Some few words, however, we must say in regard to that "*Vexata Questio*" *Ireland*, which now perplexes all. We do not, of course, refer to this year; the people are starving, and they must be fed, but let the proprietors of the soil deeply think of it. They at all events have a duty to perform, the people cannot starve for ever; and *they* cannot for ever, in wealth and quietude possess lands, which originally wrung from native proprietors, have now descended to men having little sympathy with the people.

They draw their wealth from the land, and usually spend it elsewhere; at this very moment, when the vessels of a tripartite empire are carrying provisions into Ireland, Ireland is sending forth her shiploads into England. The anomaly is one never seen before, Irish proprietors must consider it. When Alcibiades thundered at the gates of Athens, with a prostrate senate crouching on its walls, Shakespeare makes him thus speak:

"Till now you have gone on, and filled the time,
With all licentious measure, making your wills
The scope of justice; till now myself, and such
As slept within the shadow of your power,
Have wandered with our traverst arms and breathed
Our sufferance vainly. Now the time is flush,
When crouching marrow in the bearer strong,
Cries of itself—*no more*."

These words were written by a man, who of all men knew human nature best.

To two points only will we now finally allude. The first is, that our North American colonies, whether considered in reference to vicinity or climate, are undoubtedly those which should first attract the attention of government; and the second is, that the government, if not prepared to enter into the transaction themselves, should be willing to aid any association well adapted to the end, provided a fair and reasonable security was given for ulterior repayment. That this repayment is certain, under proper regulations, we have already shown by reference to the emigration of 1823-25. What was then accomplished on a small scale, may be also accomplished on a large one, now that the necessity has become more urgent, and the advance of science opened up further facilities of execution. If Lord John Russell is indeed fearful that the want of immediate employment in these noble colonies ought to preclude an extended emigration, we at once reply, *Make work* for the numbers before you send them out; encourage by government aid the construction of railways throughout Britain's own colonial possessions; open up the resources of North America, cause her magnificent forests to minister to the formation of those very roads which will afterwards bring their excess to the markets, and leave cleared acres to furnish forth the means of man's subsistence for the future; enable us to draw from the, even now, ample resources of a partly cultivated land, without trusting to that precarious means of transfer which often fails us when the emergency is greatest, for no man can command nature's proceedings or restrain the frost.

Do all this as a government, or, if not as a government, do it by aiding private enterprise, but let the nation do it *liberally*. The security will be ample in the end, and millions may yet be born who will bless the mind that had conferred the boon.

Already the thinking of these times has brought into being many private schemes founded on the principles we have endeavoured to advocate, and we have examined the majority. There is one among the many which appears to us the best organized.* It is, we believe,

* Canadian Land and Emigration Society.

yet in its infancy, but, if properly supported, must progress.

It appears indeed a large scheme, for its nominal capital is two millions. One object is the construction of a railroad from Halifax to Quebec; conceiving, as we have before urged, that such an effort would not only employ thousands of emigrants to commence with, but locate tens of thousands afterwards in comfort. Into its details we cannot go.

Hitherto the railroad system has been the *result* of high civilization, but we see no reason why it should not be the *cause* of its *production*. We have thus advocated emigration, not because we could ever wish to sever men from their home and kindred, unless a necessity compelled it; but such necessity we believe to have arisen, and what we want is, that it should be met in the most fitting manner, both as regards immediate comfort and final prosperity, and that the aid of the state can alone accomplish such objects we entirely think. Britain has, from her own resources and energies, grown to a point of population which renders her masses wretched; but she has gained ample colonies, and we see no such proper method of rectifying her erroneous position, as by advantaging her excess of people by the resources which such colonies offer.

This superabundance of population is at once a blessing and a curse; a blessing, we are bound to say, because it fulfils God's own law of man's increase—a curse, because it exemplifies in a marked manner how man can create his own social miseries.

In every quarter we find millions of busy men, many thousands of them rich as they are industrious, but tens of thousands whose daily lot is that of unceasing toil and wearing poverty, often even to starvation.

The obvious duty of the first class is, to apply their resources, judiciously, but with no sparing hand, to subdue the social wretchedness of the latter. We do not ask them to do so by the doling forth of charity—the condescending reduction, for the time, of rents; which magnifies the giver, in the eyes of man at least, far more than the receiver. We do not appeal to the Cotton Millionaire, or the Iron Hercules—sometimes, to oppose the strikes, of men made poor by their own accumulations—or at others, to magnify them into ideal, but temporary, riches,

by wages which cannot long endure. But we do beseech them to stand on higher and better ground; to consider that, if these men are poor, they often make them so; that if depraved, the want of education renders them largely unable to appreciate the truths of religion; that immorality follows in course of this incapacity, and that thus there has been weaved around the poorer orders of Britain, even up to this moment, but now breaking! a web of physical and mental thralldom, which some good men have long attempted to destroy, but which, unhappily, has, in a large degree, been hitherto defended, and that by persons who too little appreciate the final evils they are bringing on themselves and on their land. If such men have read history, or at all events understood it as history ought to be understood, they will find, that the most effectual way to induce rebellion is to starve the people. A starving man may be (for a time indeed) coerced, but never quelled.

The parallel is complete between the physical excitement of man, resulting from such causes, and its effect on his moral and religious character.

To preach religion to a man worn down by starvation, is a fiction and a farce. Some indeed there are who doubtless "Champion human fears," and rise triumphant from the trial, in remote and humble imitation of their Lord; but such are the exceptions, not the rule; and if we were asked by any Government how they could best cast out religion and morality from a land, we should emphatically reply, Starve its People!

ART. VI.—*A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the United Dioceses of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin, at his Ordinary Visitation in September 1845. By JAMES THOMAS O'BRIEN, D. D., Bishop of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin. Burnside and Seeley, Fleet Street, London. Curry and Co., Grant and Bolton, Dublin: 1846.*

HOWEVER welcome this work may be to those who embrace Dr. O'Brien's views, a sincere Protestant might, we think, reasonably question whether the time of publication and the mode of treating his subject are such

as would be chosen by a person who considered deeply the past and probably future effects of the great visitation under which Ireland is now labouring. There is a general opinion among the people, that rank, talent, and all other social influences are now, if ever, imperatively called upon to reflect on their responsibilities. Making all due allowance for the distorting influence on men's minds of great public calamity, there is yet much truth in that popular impression, if, as appears to be generally admitted, modern Europe has not witnessed so frightful a caricature of the social state as Ireland during the present year. If society were the frantic dream of Rousseau, or the purely political or selfish machine of Hobbes, and not the creation of God, a survivor of this year's famine and fever might lawfully calculate merely how far the mortgage has eaten into the estate, or the arrears adjourned the marriage of the farmer's son, or what influence the loss of one million human animals may have on political economy, or similar questions regarding money or self; but, since the law that binds man to man in society is as much from heaven as the law that binds man to God, a Christian prelate, one would think, ought to weigh scrupulously the probable, nay, the possible, effects of his writings, lest, though he avoid those atheistical or animal calculations, he should, nevertheless, in a different way prove himself equally reckless of the miseries of his country. Dr. O'Brien does not, it is true, even once allude, either in his notes or preface, to the famine or its consequences, but he appears to enforce views which must defer indefinitely the remedy of those evils, or even make them irreparable. It is not his personal Protestantism, though it is most acrid and exclusive, that we object to, but that he, an Irishman, living in Ireland, knowing that religious differences are really the root of all the miseries of Ireland, should proscribe with all the weight of his episcopal authority a species of Anglicanism, merely because it does not believe that the religion of the people of Ireland is as bad as he thinks it. It is that, when appealing, as he was bound to do, in behalf of the Protestant orphan to his reverend brethren, he exhibits the great mass of the Catholic people of his dioceses as utterly insensible to the common feelings of humanity, not far removed from the cannibals, who might be supposed feasting sumptuously on the flesh of a poor Protestant baby. And again, because, to use the

mildest phrase, he is foolish enough to represent the Catholics struggling for the rights of the British constitution as a mob of successful rebels, as slaves in the house of another, not children in their own. These are only a few of the antisocial views enforced by our learned prelate, and with a dogmatism offensively at variance with his own principles, High-church authority being, according to him, a most glaring encroachment of the pride of man on the sufficiency of Scripture and the inalienable rights of God. All the great lights of his Church, who understood, we suppose, that principle of the sufficiency of Scripture, admit that salvation is attainable in the Roman Catholic communion; many learned Anglicans of the present day receive (or, at least, do not condemn) the great body of Catholic doctrines; Catholic institutions are defended in parliament by High-church legislators; Sisters of Mercy and Christian Brothers instruct the ignorant, visit the sick, lighten the poor-rate, and would contribute much more extensively to the alleviation of the burdens of the state under the fostering care of those aristocratic orders, to which the Irish people are so fondly and indeed so foolishly attached. It would be a fond dream to expect that Dr. O'Brien would introduce such views; but would they be more injurious to Protestantism and to Ireland than his vulgar misrepresentation of the Catholic doctrine on the Sacraments?—a doctrine which he, an ex-professor of Divinity in Trinity College, ought not to have represented as excluding faith and other pious dispositions of the recipients.

If the Church Establishment be in great danger, as Dr. O'Brien assures us, the danger is not averted by the intemperate advocacy of one of its wealthy functionaries. In the city of Kilkenny, where the episcopal palace towers proudly beside two great monuments of Catholic ages, out of a population of more than 20,000 there are not one thousand Anglicans; and yet one out of the many Anglican ministers in that city enjoys a larger revenue than the Catholic bishop of the diocese. Many country parishes in the united dioceses of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin have few if any Protestants, but all are supplied with ministers enjoying in easy splendour the wealth of Catholic piety. In these days of universal bankruptcy, when the landlord looks around for something to save the wreck of his property, when the tenant

looks to the poor-house, and famine or confiscation has become a familiar and the sole alternative, it is not safe to force inconvenient contrasts of Irish establishments on public attention by uncharitable and unjust charges, though delivered by the legal lord of three dioceses. The most decided advocate of things as they are must doubt the soundness of Irish society, when he views on opposite banks of the river Nore the princely palace of the Anglican bishop, and the old grave-yard, which has received weekly during this awful year 60 or 70 victims of famine and pestilence from one union workhouse of one county of his Lordship's diocese.

But if he be severe and tyrannical to his own, Catholics have no reason to expect justice. His theology being of the low Calvinistic school, he denounces with corresponding acrimony the great movement in England. The great leaders of his own communion, who support that movement—the numerous publicists, who glory in what they deem the new life it has infused into the Anglican Church, and its beneficial influence on history and the arts—the toleration extended to it by many of its English opponents—all that could entitle it to something like respect, are no more to Dr. O'Brien than the Saxon Butlers of Ormonde were to his warlike namesakes west of the Shannon. “The strong hand for ever” appears to be his war-cry. The movement in all its phases—from the last Protestant writings of Messrs. Newman, Oakeley, and Ward, down to the semi-evangelical school of Mr. Palmer—is denounced as subversive of the Church, and to be repressed by the strong arm of episcopal authority in one-third of Leinster. No subject of Dr. O'Brien's shall presume to countenance these English Tractarians. No aspirant for episcopal favour shall presume to say that the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer are as well understood in England as in Ireland. The movement, he contends, is now more dangerous than ever, as its more daring leaders have been succeeded by more cautious followers, whose moderation, he fears, may recommend incipient popery more powerfully than the avowed Catholic predilections of their predecessors. No person can question the bishop's right to adopt for himself whatever opinions he pleases on the points disputed by members of his Church; but when he undertakes to force these opinions on others by episcopal authority, he arrogates a

right which would not be tolerated in any Catholic bishop. When he treats Messrs. Newman, Ward, and Oakeley, and other men far superior to himself, with the hauteur of a peevish pedagogue, he illustrates the old saying, that learning is not always favourable to meek humility, nor in this case to common prudence, when England herself—Protestant England, without whom the Irish Establishment could not survive one hour—is proudly invited by Dr. O'Brien to rise from her Tractarian lethargy, and learn from Ireland sound Protestant principles and the best means to uphold them. The wide extent of three dioceses is not field enough for his zeal—the errors of popery are not foes enough for his militant ardour; all errors—that is, everything opposed to Dr. O'Brien's own views on Protestant matters in England and Ireland—are dispatched with the dogmatism of the ex-professor and the bishop. That quiet, unostentatious gentleman in black, who rides through the streets of the "Faire Citie" of Kilkenny, could never be recognized in the author of this terrible charge. He could never be suspected of refusing liberty of conscience to his clergy on points not decided by his Church, nor of so far forgetting that he is the mere creature of English law, as to say to Protestant England, "Thank God, I am not like that publican."

The grand object of his charge being to preserve his clergy from the contagion of English Tractarian Protestantism, we shall commence with his solution of a most interesting question, which has sometimes been proposed by thoughtful men—namely, why the Puseyite movement has had scarcely any influence in Ireland. The question is important, and more closely connected with the social and political ills of Ireland than many of our politicians appear to imagine.

Having detailed at great length his views on modern English theology, whether of Mr. Palmer or Dr. Pusey, he adds:

"But I have not enlarged upon this state of religious belief and of religious teaching, under any apprehensions that it exists among ourselves. I feel a happy assurance that in our branch of the Church, Tractarianism has taken no deep root. There are, of course, some amongst us who have felt its various attractions, and who have been drawn to it in different degrees. But I trust that of these there are very few indeed who have embraced its entire theology, very few in whom it has eradicated a belief in the great

principles of the Reformation, that is in the leading truths of the Gospel, or so impaired a sense of their infinite importance, as to banish them from their public teaching. I am sure, that wherever Tractarian principles prevail, even if it be not to such a degree as to subvert a man's belief of those great truths, there is great risk, if not an absolute certainty, that their effect will be to cloud the clearness of his apprehension of them.....This is a great evil, though short of the greatest; and I trust that it is found to a very limited extent amongst us, and the greatest scarcely at all.

"This is indeed great matter for thankfulness. And I trust we feel some measure at least of the gratitude which we ought to feel to Him who alone has kept us safe in the midst of the great dangers by which we have been surrounded. Whatever be the means by which our security has been effected, the praise is due only to Him. But if we bear this in mind, it may be very instructive in future to look back at the means by which we have been preserved during the past. And I think it can hardly be doubted that one of these means is this: *that from various causes, and particularly from the strength of her position in this country, the Church of Rome is much more bold and unrestrained among us than in England, where she is more feeble and has more measures to keep. And that so, while the evils of her system are less softened and concealed among us, they have never been allowed to pass from our minds, for they are everywhere and always before our eyes.*

"This is no doubt one of the means by which we have been hitherto kept safe. The other, which is not wholly unconnected with this, is still more important. *It is that the great doctrines which the Reformation restored to the Church, are valued by us in some measure as they ought to be.* They passed their season of neglect here as they did in England. And they recovered their true place in both countries about the same period. *But after a time a weariness and impatience of them seemed to seize upon a considerable portion of the English branch of the Church, from which we were happily preserved.* So that without overlooking the many sound and faithful teachers which that branch of the Church enjoyed, we may still venture to say, that when the movement began, a right understanding of these great truths and a just value for them, were much more widely diffused among us than in England."—pp. 241, 242.

Here you have, in the homely language of the bishop himself, the antidote of Irish Anglicanism against the Tractarian movement. The two principal causes are marked in italics. We do not examine whether he is right in asserting that the Tractarian movement would have been a great calamity in Ireland. Some are of opinion, from happy experience, that many Englishmen and not a few Irish, in proportion to their adoption of

Tractarian principles, abandoned their anti-catholic prejudices, and felt a sincere interest in the happiness of the great mass of the Irish people. The question at present is, whether the picture, so very flattering to Irish Protestant pride, of the superior purity of Irish Protestantism, is borne out by facts; and then we shall see whether, upon the whole, the influence of the Catholic Church in Ireland ought to have been in well constituted minds a dissuasive against popery.

The "great principles of the Reformation," the "leading truths of the Gospel," so imperfectly understood in England, and so faithfully believed in Ireland, were, according to the bishop, justification by faith only, and the sufficiency of the Scriptures. The English divines, by admitting the efficacy of some sacraments, and claiming some respect for the Church of God and tradition, enabled designing men to efface the doctrine of justification by faith only and the sufficiency of the Scriptures: but these held their ground among the Irish hierarchy, who generally had nothing to do, save receive the revenues of the Church. It is a delicate task for an extern to adjust these rival pretensions of English and Irish Protestantism; and certainly would not be attempted, if history did not decide the point. And, first, with regard to the sufficiency of Scripture. It is understood thus by Dr. O'Brien and the majority of the prelates of the Established Church:

"It should not have been expected," they say, when opposing the National Schools, "that the clergy of our Church, who are bound by obligations so sacred to resist the spiritual tyranny and to oppose the errors of the Church of Rome, would join in a system of education of which the distinctive claim to acceptance and support, was the aid which it gave to one of the most violent exercises of this tyranny, that which is in fact the strength and protection of its worst errors. The principle of the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as it is maintained by our Church, is a fundamental principle of the most vital importance. *It is by means of it, that truth has been guarded and handed down to us by those who have gone before us,* p. 256. They could not connect their schools with the National Board, without practically admitting the false principles of the Church of Rome, and submitting to its tyranny, and abandoning the great principles of their own Church, concerning the sufficiency and supremacy of God's holy word."

This address, published in January, 1845, was signed by nine established prelates. A declaration of approval

was made by 1661 members of the clergy, and sanctioned in the following emphatic style by twenty Irish peers, and twenty-nine Irish members of parliament:

"We consider the maintenance of God's holy word, as the standard of religious instruction, to be inseparable from our duty to God, from the true profession of the Christian faith, and from the very foundation of our Protestant Church."—p. 264.

Here truly is a fair consensus of Irish authorities for the sufficiency of the scriptures, but happily for Christianity in these days when German infidelity threatens a scourge more desolating even than Irish famine, the church of Christ has never shown such a contradiction between her principles and her practice as the Irish Protestant church on this fundamental point. It was all over with Christianity if the infidel could exhibit her prelates renouncing during centuries, "*the very foundation of the church—that by which truth has been guarded and handed down to us by those who have gone before us.*" If the name of the bishop of Down were not attached to that address, all who know the established Church, would conclude that her prelates were grossly ignorant of the history of Ireland; no fact being more certain than that Scriptural education, the great foundation of Protestantism was, during more than two centuries, almost unknown, and discouraged by the highest authorities in Church and State in Ireland, whenever it was attempted. Talk of the tyranny of the Church of Rome, in withholding the scriptures from the laity. Frighten those well-meaning and simple souls who, with all their boasted right of private judgment, obey you as blindly as Catholics do the universal church; tell them that Rome abominates the scriptures, but do not tell them that Protestantism has been transmitted down to you in Ireland by scriptural education. Dr. O'Brien's Cathedral tells a very different story. He is a studious man. In the calm eve he has no doubt often paced the silent aisles of St. Canice's cathedral, musing among the tombs of dead bishops and princely Butlers and Graces, and sadly pondering, if we can guess from his work, over the humble protestant slab of one of the first Anglican bishops of Ossory. It is the tomb of Walsh, the first that attempted the translation of the scriptures and book of Common Prayer into Irish, "*the foundation of the Protestant church*" according to the Irish peers.

They know that, with the exception of three towns and two half counties, the English language was unknown in Ireland during the reign of Elizabeth. Yet when Walsh fell by the hand of an assassin, his work was interrupted during sixty long years of Elizabeth's reign. One impression of the Irish New Testament at last appears, and the Irish papists of the province of Connaught are compelled to pay the expenses. Dr. O'Brien admits none but apostolical miracles; no gift of tongues to enable the Irish to understand the English bible without the aid of an English schoolmaster, so that according to his noble lay associates, whose words we have quoted: "there was no true standard of religious instruction, no true profession of the Christian (Protestant) Faith, no foundation even of Protestantism, during the whole reign of Elizabeth." How awful is the responsibility of the mitred head, which in these days, confirms the delusion of many an anxious and wavering soul, on the Protestant glories of Elizabeth's Irish reign. Much better to tell them plainly with the noble peers, that there was no Protestantism in Ireland at the time. Leave the issue to their own private judgment. They cannot discover with his lordship, that the "sufficiency of Scripture" was better understood in Ireland than in England during the first sixty years of the Reformation.

If it be urged in extenuation, that the troubled state of the country prevented the accomplishment of the good work, besides the obvious answer, that the tithes were exacted, and that the scholars in Dublin and other places were not troubled by war, there is good reason to believe, that the more powerful party in the church were unwilling to purchase the Protestantizing of the Irish at the expense of the revival of the Irish language. English prejudice and Irish law against that language overcame the zeal of proselytism. For when after the lapse of nearly half a century from the death of Elizabeth, an Englishman be-thought himself of translating the old Testament into Irish, there arose such a storm of opposition against him, excited by Strafford and the High Church Bramhall, that the translator was cast into a dungeon in Dublin, and the zealous prelate, his patron, was accused of a design which had never entered into the plans of Anglican prelates. "His measures," it was said, "were contrary to the interests of the English in Ireland, by his endeavouring to

make the conquered and enslaved Irish, capable of preferment in church and state, which no man did ever so much as once attempt before his lordship." Bramhall, who opposed the translation of the bible, and in the convocation of 1634, who opposed the use of the Irish book of prayer even where the congregation was Irish, is yet canonized by Jeremy Taylor, so little were those great lights of the Irish church sensible of the tyranny of withholding the scriptures from the people. Were these men, or their Irish contemporaries, advocates of the sufficiency of scripture? Was scriptural education the foundation of Protestantism, when no English schools were established, and no Irish bibles or common prayers allowed? how can our modern prelates tell their credulous disciples, that the use and sufficiency of the bible is the great principle by which truth has been handed down to them? Cromwell conquered and laid Ireland prostrate, yet no attempt was made to preach the bible, and how the zeal of a few individuals succeeded is summed up in a few queries of bishop Berkeley, 1745: which prove that the Anglican church had never attempted the conversion of the Irish by scripture; that its ministers were aliens in blood and language to the people of Ireland, and that in ancient as well as in more modern times, it was a corporation held by a few powerful families, for their own private interests and the upholding of English views.* To us it would seem that a serious review of the conduct of the Irish church on this use of the Irish scriptures and the book of common prayer, so far from being an antidote against Tractarianism, would

* 91. Whether the upper part of this people are not truly English by blood, language, religion, manners.

340. If the revenues allotted for the encouragement of religion and learning, were made hereditary in the hands of a dozen lay lords and as many overgrown commoners, whether the public would be much the better of it?

341. Whether the Church's patrimony belongs to one tribe alone?

Our Church and our State dear England maintains,
For which all true Protestant hearts should be glad,
She sends us our bishops, our judges, our deans,
And better would give us, if better she had;
But lord! how the rabble will stare and will gape,
When they hear, &c.

SWIFT.

be a strong argument for the claims of the old church. Perhaps we do not make sufficient allowance for early prejudices and the authoritative declarations of living Protestant prelates on Anglican minds. Powerful indeed, they must be, when men can obey as the church of Christ, a corporation which, from Bale to Berkeley, withheld the scriptures from the people, and read divine service in an unknown tongue, "a practice in their own principles," plainly repugnant to the divine law and the usage of the primitive church. The subsequent history of the Irish church affords no proof that the great Protestant principle or scripture was better understood in Ireland than in England, unless the period to which Dr. O'Brien vaguely alludes, was that in which he inculcated his own notions in Trinity College. To avoid the disagreeable task of a review of the Irish church in relation to scripture circulation and sufficiency, we extract a few reflections on Apostolical zeal from our author's remarks on foreign missions. Having warned his brethren against giving too much importance to those missions, and given a very high place to what is doing to make our Roman Catholic countrymen (even in present times) acquainted with the word of God, through the medium of the Irish language, his lordship lays down the following principles, which each one can apply at his leisure to those 250 years, during which the Irish language was alone understood by the Irish people.

"In those remoter objects, (the foreign missions,) there is so much to strike the imagination, and through such impressions to act upon the feelings, while all the repulsive incidents which belong to the realities of life are kept far from us, that the interest which we take in them may be very delusive, whether regarded as a proof of our Christianity or our benevolence. And there is no doubt we are deceiving ourselves if we rest upon such a proof, while we are neglecting the claims of objects around us. For God, while He commends, as I have said, all men to our love and good offices, very distinctly sanctions the gradations among their claims, which men's natural feelings and their common sense have everywhere established. Indeed, not only are there passages in the revealed word, expressly affirming the precedence of those claims which are founded on close kindred and upon community of faith, (and thereby, by parity of reason, in their proper order, other distinctions, (as of country, &c.) resting upon the same natural principles;) but we are distinctly told, that whatever other indications of Christian principle there may be in us, we have a sure proof that they are fallacious, when we find ourselves neglecting those near and pressing

duties. And so whatever measure of sympathy and aid we bestow upon remote missions, if we take no interest and no share in the various undertakings to abate the misery, and the ignorance, and the vice, and the error which we have at home, there is no room to doubt, that we are either misled by very mistaken principles of duty, or are not acting from any sense of duty at all."—pp. 23, 24.

Great moral truths do not change with time or circumstances. The closing words are a fearful epitaph on the Hiberno Anglican church.

The second "great Protestant truth," which England has obscured and Ireland preserved, is justification by faith only,—a doctrine which Dr. O'Brien sets off by the usual vulgar misrepresentation of the Catholic doctrine on the sacraments. If the opinion of unprejudiced persons all the world over, who regard justification by faith only as hardly less practically immoral than Gnosticism, be entitled to any respect, the Irish Church has indeed a most unenviable pre-eminence; as her most ardent advocate cannot easily discover in her whole history many grounds of her justification but her workless faith. We do not say that Irish ministers would work ill where any minister could work well, nor charge upon the Irish Church precisely the abdication of all the functions of a Church, and the notorious absence of any good influence on the country, until we hear that any body of men, English or Irish, could master the difficulties of the position in which they were placed.* It is by no means astonishing that a secular corporation, the mere servant of the state, the slaves of a few English bishops, who were the slaves of English policy, should have left few spiritual works to justify their memory—that they should have taken an oath during several centuries to erect an English school in their parishes, and violate it—that, down to Strafford's government, the Church was covered with the leprosy of simony, and her property made away for ever to

* "Although a proper and just Reformation were allowed to be necessary, yet the passions and vices of men had mingled themselves so far as to pervert and confound all the good endeavours of those who intended well; and thus the Reformation in every country where it was attempted, was carried on in the most impious and scandalous manner that can possibly be conceived."—Swift, *Universal Hatred against the Clergy*.

bishops' sons or friends: in a word, that there was more national good done by this clergy during the last year than by the combined labours of all their predecessors to Elizabeth's day. This will not surprise us, because the Anglican clergy, though slaves themselves, were the masters of slaves. Irresponsible power over the great mass of the wretched people was in their hands. Entrenched like a garrison in an enemy's country, without subjects on whom to exercise their ministry, living in idleness on the sweat of the Irish serf, looking to the nod of the last English clerical import, the jest or boon companion of her aristocratic sons,—how could even angelic natures resist such temptations, or check the bad passions which vegetate more rankly under the cassock of the indolent clerical tyrant than under the soldier's belt? They enjoyed princely revenues, but where are their national fruits? where the churches, colleges, or hospitals, or those truly charitable institutions, which ask no test but misery in the applicant, and which could help the country in such years as these? Where are the painters, sculptors, or architects, that flourished under her patronage? Travellers used to say of Ireland before 1780, that she was like a new country—nothing but ruins and uncultivated wastes, except the material comforts of the north, and the enterprise of Catholic merchants in the towns of the south. Benevolent individuals were never wanting, but there is no concession to the wretched Catholic which the Establishment did not oppose, no additional penal law which was not principally her work. There is sad evidence, indeed, that the speculative dogma of justification by faith only, which was engrafted on the Irish Church by the low Calvinism of her most eminent early teachers, has produced the results which might be naturally expected from a vicious principle developing itself in the most favourable circumstances. It was neither prudent, nor in good taste, with the history of his Church before him, to bring a French comedian to his help in describing a paltry grant made to the Irish Catholic.* But if it was not beneath the dignity of a

* Dr. O'Brien gives the following dialogue as a specimen "of the style in which the Roman Catholics put forward their demands, and of the class of arguments on which they rely." A slight manœuvre of the *dramatis personæ* turns the arrow against himself. For "Premier Porteur" read "Eveque," for "Deuxieme

grave bishop to go to the theatre, it cannot be improper to allow our readers to decide whether the extract be a better allegory of the relations between the Established Church and the people of Ireland, than between the people and the government. Dr. O'Brien of course will say that justification by faith only does not exclude works of charity. We hope it may not do so in future. May he at length awake to the ineffable charity of letting Irish Protestantism stand on its own merits, resigning tithes and Church lands to the poor, relieving the farmer and landlord, relying on its own apostolical merits and the zeal of its children for support, and removing the only obstacle to the healthy reorganization of Irish elements and the peace and security of the empire.

The second great cause of the resistance of Protestant Ireland to English Tractarianism, is the unreserved development of the Romanist religion in Ireland. Judging from Dr. O'Brien's views expressed in various places, we should say that the most offensive development of the Catholic religion is her regard for certain ceremonies, to which he appears to have the most invincible repugnance. Now, unfortunately, it so happens that, in what is called the externals of religion, the full pomp of the Roman

Porteur" "Ministre," and for "Mascarille" "Irlandois," or "Papiste."

"*Deuxieme Porteur.* Payez nous donc, s'il vous plait, Monsieur.

"*Mascarille.* Hein ?

"*Deux. Port.* Je dis, Monsieur, que vous nous donniez de l'argent, s'il vous plait.

"*Mascar.* [*lui donnant un soufflet.*] Comment, coquin ? demander de l'argent d'une personne de ma qualité !"

"*Premier Porteur.* [*prenant un des bâtons de la chaise.*] Cà, payez moi vite ment.

"*Mascar.* Quoi ?

"*Prem. Port.* Je dis que je veux de l'argent tout à l'heure.

"*Mascar.* Il est raisonnable.

"*Prem. Port.* Vite, donc.

"*Mascar.* Oui-dà ! tu parles comme il faut, toi—tiens. Es-tu content ?

"*Prem. Port.* Non, je ne suis pas content. [*levant son bâton.*]

"*Mascar.* Doucement ; tiens. On obtient tout de moi quand on s'y prend de la bonne façon."

Mascarille had a chair for his money, in which he has the advantage of the Papist.—p. 294.

ceremonial, the Catholic Irish are remarkably deficient. Unprejudiced persons, with good means of information, will even assert that England carries out more fully than Ireland the ceremonies of the Catholic Church. We can hardly suppose, then, that Dr. O'Brien, with all his puritanical hatred of ceremonies, intended to mark their excess as "that vicious development of Catholicity which was always before his eyes" in Ireland. We must take the development in a more extensive signification, comprising dogmas, moral precepts, and church government, all the influences of religion on the affairs of this world and of the world to come, on private character and political conduct—in a word, all the attributes of a religion purporting to come from God, and claiming a right to direct the actions of men. Taken in this extensive sense, the development of the Catholic religion in Ireland must be most offensive to Dr. O'Brien, though we are equally sure it must command the respect of any unprejudiced mind. Strength, power to resist and to conquer the combined energies of the most powerful kingdom on earth, working by the most unscrupulous tools—such has been one striking attribute of Irish Catholicity. Broad acres and high titles do not make the souls of their possessors one whit more valuable in the eyes of God and the Church than the souls of the beggar. The "rank, wealth, and respectability" of Ireland may be stereotyped as Protestant (though the aggregate of Catholic wealth is great, whatever Mr. Godley may say to the contrary),* but the millions are Catholic. Seven millions of Catholics against half-a-million of Protestants, after nearly three hundred years' exclusive possession of the government and ecclesiastical wealth of this kingdom by Protestants, is a development of Catholic energy which ought to command the respect of those who believe that the Christian religion itself derives great support from the ages of the martyrs and catacombs. Review the history of Ireland. The second of Elizabeth is passed, but remains a dead letter except in two points—the transfer of the ecclesiastic property, and the prohibition of public mass wherever it was practicable. Catholics could not be excluded from the House of Lords or Commons, nor from

* The Irish are charged with indolence. Spenser, their enemy, did not think so: "the most part of their baser sort are fit for labour, and industriously disposed."—*State of Ireland*.

the bench, or corporations, or the commission of the peace among the Catholic Anglo-Irish. Elizabeth had no power beyond the length of her deputy's sword over the native Irish; they were in war against her religion, her laws, and her crown—a war of resistance to conquest. But when they were conquered at the close of her reign, all who had escaped famine and the sword were Catholic in all parts of Ireland, with the exception of the very small number of English immigrants and the clergy of the Established Church, with their wives and families.* During the reign of Elizabeth the great mass of the Anglo-Irish were not only loyal, but constituted the main force of the royal army. They had always acknowledged the English crown. The Irish chieftains had different views, but it belongs to our purpose here merely to say, that their conduct was angelic compared with the atrocities of their mailed and helmed apostles. James succeeds, and for forty years there is something like peace, at least compared with the preceding reign. An attempt was made to compel attendance at Protestant service, and to banish all friars and seminary priests. Both attempts miserably failed. The Catholics were excluded from offices of trust; but they were a large minority in the Commons, a respectable number in the Lords, all the towns were theirs, almost all the farmers, and in 1641 one half the landed property, even after the confiscation of the properties of the Ulster earls (carried by the loyal recusants of the Pale) and all the courts of inquisition into the defective titles. Here, during this period, there is no reason to blush at the development of Catholicity, except perhaps at the selfish acquiescence of the Catholics of the Pale in the attainder of the two Ulster earls. The great mass of the nation was patient and loyal, and devotedly attached to their religion, notwithstanding the persecutions and excommunication of pastors without flocks, and in the north flocks without pastors. Great literary works were planned and executed partly during this period. The Protestant nobles were beginning to contract the old Irish ties of gossipred and fosterage with their Catholic peers, and

* *Quis facili credat, quod certo certius constat, in tota illa gente sexaginta annorum spatio, nec poena atrocissima, nec premio amplissimo totos ducentos in hæreticorum sententiam hactenus concessisse.*—Fitzimon *Britanomachiae*, Lib. 3, pars. 8, cap. 5.

the learning of Protestant scholars was toiling with the Catholic on the old Catholic history of the country to bring about in due time a closer union, when that fatal epoch, 1641, adjourned for some centuries the happy consummation. The Ulster Irish rose to recover properties of which they had been unjustly deprived. All the rest of Ireland was driven into rebellion. Who, that knows the records of that period from 1641 to 1650, will say that the atrocious guilt of cold-blooded murder, treachery, the violation of all the laws, not of war only, but of humanity, was on the side of the Catholics? One damning sin, and that almost the only one, they were guilty of—discord; for which they suffered as no other nation ever has. But, upon a review of the ten years during which they enjoyed power, though the revolutionist will certainly find many reasons to censure their scrupulous indecision and excessive moderation, when opposed to such enemies, the unprejudiced reader, even Dr. O'Brien himself, could hardly say that they were hurried into those criminal excesses which characterize the slave in power, or added to the ordinary horrors of war. Of the awful period of the Protectorate, it is enough to say that the storm descended on the Episcopalians and the Catholics. The former disappeared from Ireland during ten years, either by death or exile, or more generally by conformity to the parliamentary creed. The latter were as great a difficulty as ever to English governors after the restoration. They were expelled from the cities built by their fathers, excluded for the first time from the house of commons, though admitted in the lords, robbed by the act of settlement of almost all their landed property for having been simple enough to make peace and cessations with Ormonde, and fight for their king. Surely Dr. O'Brien will not say that the fidelity of the Catholics of Ireland to James II. was an awful development of immorality, and if all the acts of Irish Catholics were as bad as he would have them, compare them with the penal code of William, Anne, and the Georges; a code enacted by Anglicans, at the suggestion of Anglican bishops, for the protection of the Anglican church. Recrimination is useless and not intended, but let any man of sense review that code, and surely it is one of the greatest miracles in the order of nature, that it did not debase its victims for ever, and obliterate almost the image of God from their

souls. Yet in 1780, the Catholic Irish were not bad fathers nor brothers: they were industrious and wealthy merchants in towns where they had scope for their energies* as citizens—they were patient, for that was the only duty the laws allowed them, they preserved still all the great and good lineaments of their national character, with the inevitable mixture of the vices of slaves, and they preserved all by religion. The spirit of religion that cheered on the enthusiast in the victory of Benburb, or the retreat from Kinsale, does not even appear half so sublime as the stern endurance of the last miserable century, miserable for Irish Ascendancy, but glorious for the people of Ireland. The old Celtic fidelity to national character is in nothing more remarkable than in the strong propensity of the Irish, even at the present to worship sounding names and respectable lineage. The name of a noble would be an abomination to any other nation in Europe if it had suffered half so much as Ireland has suffered from nobles during the last three centuries, and yet if a council of Irish historians and men thoroughly acquainted with Irish character, were empowered to form an independent constitution for Ireland, we presume they would unanimously

* 266. Whether the seaports of Galway, Limerick, Cork, Waterford, are not to be looked on as the keys of this kingdom? and whether the merchants are not possessed of those keys? and who are the most numerous merchants in those cities?

262. Whether it be not of great advantage to the Church of Rome, that she hath clergy suited to all ranks of men, in gradual succession from Cardinals down to beggars?—Berkeley.

To this latter query a few others may be added for the consideration of political economists.

How many Irish tradesmen, peasants, cottiers, &c., &c., are exempt from Poor Rates by the New Poor Law?

How far have those peasants, &c., hitherto contributed to support the Irish Poor?

Will they contribute now, if some cheap Catholic Bureau de Bienfaisance, or Brothers of Charity, such as exist in Catholic countries, be not established?

Whether such Catholic Institution or the Poor House have the greater chance of donations and legacies?

Vast sums of money have been expended during the last fifteen years in the erection of Catholic buildings in Ireland. It was cheerfully contributed, principally by that class which the law exempts from Poor Rates.

declare that the most extensive franchises and all the guarantees ever sanctioned by English law, would be required to protect the liberty of the people of Ireland against an Irish aristocracy of average worth, especially if that aristocracy were on friendly terms with the Catholic Church. Is not this fidelity to what we believe is a good principle of the Irish character, a fidelity through such persecutions, creditable to the people and their only instructor during the last two centuries—the Catholic Church? at least it is not what Dr. O'Brien would designate an awful development of Catholic principles. Are the legal and constitutional means, by which the Catholics of Ireland have now the corporations and the majority of Irish constituencies, unworthy of the descendants of those who extorted Magna Charta? Are the new churches and convents and other foundations of public beneficence and charity, which have sprung up as if by magic, under the inspiration of the Catholic Church, during the last ten years, a development at which Catholics must blush or Protestants tremble, if they respect the practical energy of religious conviction? Dr. O'Brien affects to dread persecution, though he must know that it never was a trait in Irish character, if the recovery of equal rights and laws be not persecution. The persecution he dreads is the loss of tithes and church-lands, the application of public wealth to public purposes, not for the benefit of a miserable minority of the people. If all the church-land in Ireland became in one night irreclaimable swamps, and all tithes were abolished, Dr. O'Brien himself might soon change his opinion of the Irish Catholics, and encourage his followers to co-operate with their countrymen to arrest general ruin. At present his lordship knows, that while some hundreds of thousands in Ireland are bound to party by the massive gold chains of the establishment, general co-operation for the country is either moonshine or a miracle.

Our limited space prevents the admission of some specimens of his lordship's theology. But an average example is enough. The author of the *Life of St. Wilfrid*, having stated that some persons who made vows of chastity were often grievously tempted, expressed himself thus: "the preservation of holy virginity is like an actual protracted life-long crucifixion." The Christian Bishop starts at this word, "crucifixion!" but suppose that some monks or

priests are tempted to yield to propensities, which have unfortunately been often unlawfully indulged even by married ministers, may not those temptations be for them that cross which all must take up who follow Christ, that persecution which all must undergo who wish to live piously in Christ? Shall a Christian Bishop be scandalized if the practice of a Christian virtue be called a crucifixion, when St. Paul desires to be crucified to the world, dead to the flesh and its concupiscences, and when these and similar expressions have been consecrated by the usage of all ages, to designate Christian virtue. His lordship should expunge the obnoxious words from Scripture,* before he indulged in the ribald bigotry of his favourite Luther. Like Bishop Burnet he "smells Popery at 500 miles distance, better than fanaticism just under his nose."

We shall not return to this subject, until some man of station in the opposite ranks, casts the first stone. It will then become necessary to break through the privileged *historical* toleration extended to the Irish Establishment in this historical age; to give its history by epochs; to compare it with the Anglo-Irish Catholic Church of the four preceding centuries, and show where they differ and agree in their exclusiveness, their influence on the arts and other social wants, and on the government of the country. The sketches can easily be drawn from Anglican authorities alone, and may help to fill up a great chasm in the history of Ireland.

* And they that are Christ's, have *crucified* their flesh with the vices and concupiscences.—Gal. v. 24.

But God forbid, that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is *crucified* to me and I to the world.—Gal. vi. 14.

ART. VII.—*Lives of the Queens of England.* Vol. IX. *Mary Beatrice of Modena.* By AGNES STRICKLAND. London: Henry Colburn. 1846.

THIS volume is in some respects, the most interesting of the series. Graceful language, vivacity, candour, and fearless exposure of error are to be expected; they are Miss Strickland's characteristics: but in addition to all this, the *Life of Mary of Modena* has, from its very nature a peculiar but mournful interest, little short of that of the martyred Queen of Scots. It tells of a princess, the most beautiful of the daughters of Italy, who in her prosperity was adored by all that knew her, become on a sudden the sport of the most trying reverses; it tells of the prince her husband, whose valour and genius had earned the encomiums of Turenne himself, and in Southwold Bay had taught the Dutch that the "Meteor flag of England" was now upon the deep, and whose principles of religious toleration would have achieved in the seventeenth century, what it has been the glory of the nineteenth to accomplish—this prince vilified as a bigot and a coward, plotted against by an interested faction, and, together with his consort, driven from his throne by the bayonets of the very Dutch whom he had so often vanquished: it tells of the family that had sprung from both, wandering in beggary and exile; a butt against which the Tory and the Whig, the pamphleteer and the statesman, the hunter of pension or preferment both in church and in state, all alike that hoped for any thing from William of Orange or the first princes of the House of Hanover, all directed the unceasing shafts of wit, malice, dullness, and ridicule. And now that this fair princess and her gallant but unfortunate lord have been a century and a half in their graves, and their children too, and their whole race, have joined them in the house of death, now at last is faction silent and the voice of truth is heard, and men who bow in hearty loyalty to the queen, dare yet with the freedom of Britons denounce the calumnies of the past, and proclaim the merits, without extenuating the faults, of the princely dead.

Well may the fair authoress exult in her labours: it is a noble office to vindicate the oppressed and to hold up to the terror of evil-doers, the resistless energy of truth,

which thus prevails over wealth and faction and all-devouring time itself. Let us then follow the steps of the authoress ; and see what are the deeds, that we may judge of the merits of James of York and Mary of Modena. The present volume contains their marriage ; their exile in Holland and Scotland ; their elevation to the English throne ; their expulsion ; and the first years of their residence in France. The sequel of their history is told in another volume. Mary Beatrice was daughter of Alphonso d'Este, duke of Modena. She was born in 1658, and was entrusted for education to a community of Carmelite Nuns. When, in her fifteenth year, she was offered the hand of James the duke of York, and heir-presumptive of the throne of England, Mary Beatrice showed little eagerness for the prospect before her. Her thoughts were all of the simplicity and purity of the cloister : she had no other wish than to become a spouse of Christ. She was overruled, however, by the authority of her mother, the duchess of Modena, and after a painful struggle gave her acquiescence.

The earl of Peterborough was James's envoy to the court of Modena. His long search for a wife previous to his arrival in Italy is told with amusing earnestness, and is retailed in the same spirit by Miss Strickland. When he had gained the duchess, and had disclosed his mission to the young princess the latter answered " with a little fierceness,"

" That she was obliged to the king of England and the duke of York for their good opinion ; but she could not but wonder why from so many princesses of more merit, who would esteem that honour, and be ready to embrace it, they should persist in endeavouring to force the inclination of one who had vowed herself, as much as was in her power, to another sort of life, out of which she never could think she should be happy ; and she desired his excellency,' even, as he fancied, with tears in her eyes, ' if he had an influence with his master, to oblige her by endeavouring to avert any further persecution of a maid, who had an invincible aversion to marriage. Princesses they were enow,' she said, ' in Italy, and even in that house, who would not be unworthy of so great an honour, and who, from the esteem they might have thereof, would deserve it much better than she could do.'

" However piqued the earl might be at the lofty disdain with which the youthful beauty received his compliments, and her earnest endeavours to defend herself from the unwelcome alliance to which he was wooing her, he was too able a diplomatist to take

any notice of her pointed hint, that his master's addresses would be more agreeable and suitable to her aunt than to herself. In reply to all her passionate rhetoric on the propriety of his allowing her to fulfil that vocation to which it was her desire to devote herself, his excellency told her, 'that he begged her pardon if he could not obey her; he might have been induced to do so before he saw her, but now it was impossible, since he could not believe she was made for other end than to give princes to the world, who should adorn it with characters of high virtue and merit; that his country had need of such, and he would now hazard the offending her by persisting in his demand; since if he did incur her displeasure by it, it would be the means of making her one of the happiest princesses in the world.' The earl complains that for all that he could say, the princess appeared dissatisfied at his persistence."—pp. 37, 38.

"The princess then, at last, gave herself up to the will of her friends. It was not as she herself afterwards declared without floods of tears that she yielded to her mother's commands, which she had never before ventured to dispute.

"When a reluctant assent had thus been wrung, by maternal authority, from poor Mary Béatrice, the earl of Peterborough assumed his official character of ambassador extraordinary from the king of England to that court; and procurator and proxy for his royal highness, James, duke of York and Albany's marriage with the princess, sister to the duke."—p. 40.

In the old earl's account of this match there is much to make an attentive reader suspect, that it was written long after the earl's return, when the impressions of facts and opinions had begun to fade from his aged memory. Certain it is that, as the authoress herself observes, there is a "difficulty in reconciling" some parts of his narrative with the assertions of James.

We are told, for instance, by the earl that the pope refused to grant a dispensation; and by Miss Strickland, in explanation of the earl's account, that this dispensation was necessary, because, "as he (the duke of York) had made no public profession of reconciliation to the church of Rome, the pope took the present opportunity of giving him every annoyance!"—p. 34.

Now the earl's idea of the necessity of a dispensation, if he had such while in Italy, arose probably from the arts of the politicians who sought to thwart the marriage. At all events, James himself tells a very different story; and James surely could have learned the truth either from the lips of his new duchess or from her mother the Duchess

of Modena, who accompanied her into England: and if James knew the truth, he would certainly have told it, and therefore it is that his memoirs are so invaluable a source of historical knowledge. What then is James's statement? Simply this: "She (Mary Beatrice) had at that time, a great inclination to be a nun, insomuch that the duchess, her mother, was obliged to get the pope to write to her, and persuade her to comply with her wish, as most conducive to the service of God and the public good." Such testimony is, we think, conclusive. Let us, however, hear what the accurate Muratori says: "But because the thoughts of this princess were directed to a higher object, she being resolved to consecrate herself to God in a monastery, it was almost impossible to obtain her consent. Nor would the difficulty have been overcome, if the sovereign Pontiff, considering that such a marriage would be for the good of christianity, had not interposed his paternal exhortations."*

It is needless to accumulate other authorities upon an obscure genealogy. But what are we to think of the gratuitous motive assigned to the pope of withholding the dispensation in order to give James "every annoyance?" It is an historian's duty, Miss Strickland justly observes in her preface, when explaining the words of Guizot, "to say nothing either in the way of praise or censure, which cannot be substantiated by sound evidence," (XI). Yet her own remarks upon the pope are hardly in conformity with her rule: the refusal of the dispensation is not "substantiated by sound evidence," and the assignment of a motive and such a motive, is both gratuitous and harsh. The poor popes! they must receive the lash, or perhaps the writer will be pitied for his ignorance or his illiberal narrow-minded conceptions! With the popes began the system of misrepresentation that has so long disgraced our literature; and to them does prejudice still cling when it is falling off from all things else.

We wish not, however, to speak severely of one to

* "Ma perchè più alto tendevano i pensieri di questa Principessa, risoluta di consacrarsi a Dio in un Monastero, S'incontravano troppe difficoltà ad ottenere il suo assenso. Nè si sarebbero superate, se il Sommo Pontefice, considerando, che in tale Nozze concorreva il bene della Christianità, non avesse interposto le sue paterne esortazioni."—Mur. Ann. D' Ital. tom. XI. An. 1673.

whom the lovers of truth are so greatly indebted: several other passages containing similar faults we purposely omit, that we may not appear unreasonably censorious. What has been already said should be sufficient to inspire caution alike in the use of authorities and in the announcement of opinions.

When at last the young bride had given a reluctant consent, had married James by proxy, and accompanied by her mother, the duchess, was approaching England, the repugnance to the marriage, so long subdued, produced a dangerous fever. When she had recovered, and had landed at Dover, she "is said to have betrayed her aversion to the duke," for she was too artless to conceal her emotions. The principles however which she had learned in the convent, she cherished in the world; and these principles which had taught her to yield up her love of the cloister at the call of obedience, taught her likewise to conquer her feelings, and to become towards one who was often an unfaithful husband, the most dutiful and affectionate of wives. So completely indeed did she overcome her repugnance, that she condemned her subsequent attachment to James as excessive, because she thought it had impeded spiritual duties, and interrupted her converse with God. This condemnation, however, was only that of an humble and even a saintly mind: it never altered the innocence of her life, nor withdrew her from reading her Latin Vulgate, or from her other daily devotions. Unable as Miss Strickland must be to appreciate the holiness of Catholicity, she is yet, in general, a fair witness of the beauty of Mary's character; and therefore her own views of that character are not uninteresting and are evidently sincere.

"How generally blameless her conduct was, at the tender age when she was torn from her peaceful convent to become the wife of a careless husband, whose years nearly trebled her own, and the stepmother of princesses old enough to be her sisters, may be perceived even from the unfriendly evidence of bishop Burnet himself. 'She was,' says he, 'a very graceful person, with a good measure of beauty, and so much wit and cunning, that during all this reign she behaved herself in so obliging a manner, and seemed so innocent and good, that she gained upon all that came near her, and possessed them with such impressions of her, that it was long before her behaviour after she was a queen could make them change their thoughts of her. So artificially did this young Italian

behave herself, that she deceived even the eldest and most jealous persons both in court and country. Only sometimes a satirical temper broke out too much, which was imputed to youth and wit not enough practised to the world. She avoided the appearance of a zealot or a meddler in business, and gave herself up to innocent cheerfulness, and was universally esteemed and beloved as long as she was a duchess.'

"'Upwards of twelve years,' (adds Miss Strickland). Rather a trying time for the most practised of hypocrites to have supported the part which this candid divine attributes to an inexperienced girl who commenced her career in public life at fifteen. If Mary Beatrice had, at that tender age, acquired not only the arts of simulation and dissimulation in such perfection, but the absolute control over every bad passion which Burnet imputes to her, so as to deceive the most watchful of her foes, and to conciliate the love and esteem of all who came near her, she might assuredly have governed the whole world. Unfortunately for herself, this princess was singularly deficient in the useful power of concealing her feelings; it is impossible to refrain from smiling at the idea of any one attributing policy so profound to the unsophisticated child of nature, who preferring the veil of a cloistered votaress to the prospect of the crown matrimonial of England, had interrupted the diplomatic courtship of a grave ambassador with passionate reproaches for his cruelty in endeavouring to marry her to his master against her inclination, and with tearful earnestness intimated how much more suitable and welcome the alliance would be to her maiden aunt than to herself, and was too little practised in deception to be able to conceal either her disinclination to her consort, in the first instance, or her too ardent affection for him when he had succeeded in winning her virgin love. If, then, so young a creature whose greatest fault was her proneness to yield to the impulse of her feelings, conducted herself for twelve years so perfectly, as not to give cause of complaint to any one, not even to her step-daughters, the natural inference is, that she acted under the influence of more conscientious motives than those which guided the pen of her calumniator.

"Mary Beatrice applied herself to the study of the English language to such good purpose, that she soon became a perfect mistress of all its intricacies, and not only spoke, read, and wrote it with fluency, but was able to appreciate the literature of that Augustan age. She had the good taste and good policy to pay distinguishing attention to persons of literary talent. She took great pleasure in the conversation of the aged Waller, and playfully commanded him to write....It was highly to the credit of so young a creature as Mary Beatrice that her mind was too well regulated to be alloyed with the vanity which the flattering incense offered up at the shrine of her beauty by the greatest wits of the age, was calculated to excite in a female heart. The purity of her

manners and conduct entitled her to universal respect. It was observed in that wanton, licentious court, where voluptuousness stalked unmasked, and gloried in its shame, that the youthful duchess of York afforded a bright example of feminine propriety and conjugal virtue. She appeared like a wedded Dian, walking through Paphian bowers in her calm purity."—pp. 65-67.

The Duchess of York was passionately fond of music, but had strong moral objections to the coarse comedies of the era; she even entertained doubts of the propriety of appearing at operas, though Italian singers were patronised by her. She was wont to say, "that there was no sin she believed, in going to theatres, provided the pieces that were represented were not of an objectionable character; the stage might and ought to be rendered a medium of conveying moral instruction to the public, instead of flattering and inculcating vice."—(pp. 133-34.)

The reader may now be desirous of seeing the reverse of the medal, but that reverse was almost a blank. Indeed, of the few instances of her faults given by Miss Strickland, it is remarkable that the fault is not in the act itself, but in the motive which the Authoress thinks she has discovered. Such discoveries are often self-delusions. The following is one of the most serious charges that can be attributed to the almost blameless Mary of Modena; yet even this we are told, was kept within limits by self-control.

"However perfect her conduct was as a wife, she was not without her faults as a woman; and of these her natural inclination to fancy herself too far above her fellow-creatures was the most injurious, and had it not subjected her to a salutary check, might have alienated the affection with which the old Scotch Cavaliers were prepared to regard her.

"One day James invited the famous General Dalziel to dine privately with him. The character of this devoted adherent of Charles I., is familiar to our readers from the brilliant sketch drawn by Sir Walter Scott in 'Old Mortality.' The Duchess of York, seeing three covers laid at table, asked her husband who was to dine with them, and when informed, she greatly objected to dine with a private gentleman. Dalziel entered at the moment, and heard the subject of the dispute before the duchess was aware of the presence of her guest; and, with a spirit still haughtier than her own, thus addressed her: 'Madame, I have dined at a table where *your* father stood behind my back!' He alluded to the time when, as a General in the imperial service, he had dined

in state with the emperor, for whom the Duke de Modena, as one of the vassals of the empire, performed personal service.

"Instead of testifying any resentment at this well-merited rebuke, Mary Beatrice turned playfully to her husband, and said, 'never offend the pride of proud men.'"—(p. 102.)

Amiable as was the character of Mary, she was not long to escape the misery with which splendour is always purchased. She had scarcely attained her twentieth year, when her trials began; and they were to end only with her life. If for some years she still continued free from personal annoyance, she suffered greatly: for her hopes and fears were those of her husband. Occasionally too she had a more immediate share in the calumnies that were so liberally dealt out to her lord. The series of plots that were thus entangling the unfortunate couple deserve, perhaps, a more comprehensive though in many respects a much briefer notice than that of our Authoress.

The party against James had sprung up even before his marriage with the Princess of Modena; but was not completely organised until after that event. Its leaders were Shaftesbury and Buckingham. The latter was the enemy, and was one of the chief instruments in the fall of Clarendon, the father-in-law of James. Feeling however, that now he had no favour to expect from the latter, and had reason to expect his vengeance, he resolved to do his utmost to exclude him from the succession. Shaftesbury was once a republican; then a friend and adviser of Cromwell; and had found means to earn the favour of Charles. He was as unprincipled as Buckingham, and conceiving himself injured by his sovereign, had thrown himself into the ranks of the opposition, and sought to revenge himself upon Charles by every means of annoyance, and even by an attempt to hurl him from his throne. The offer of Buckingham's alliance was eagerly embraced: James had become a Catholic, and the conspirators knew how easily they could array against him the prejudices of the nation; and if James were rendered powerless, Charles might be more easily assailed. Such, if we may judge from their deeds, was the twofold scheme of these able but revengeful men.

To prepare the way, reports of "Popish Plots" were busily circulated; and all Protestants were warned to beware of a secret but imminent danger that threatened

their property, consciences, and lives. James, they were reminded, had openly professed himself a Catholic, and had married a Catholic wife; and Charles, it was added, was about to imitate his brother's example, and was scheming with Louis of France to introduce Popery at the point of the bayonet. Men were amazed at these reiterated reports. Some of the statement they knew to be true, and, blinded by prejudice, they easily believed the rest. Shaftesbury exulted in his success and sought to confirm it by every popular art. Amongst the members of the country party; with the merchants on exchange; wherever, in short, public attention might be excited, or popularity gained, there was Shaftesbury, full of condescension, full of familiarity. Whatever he was before, he was now, in the eyes of the people, a persecuted patriot, a martyr to the liberties of his country. The very pulpits resounded with the praises of one, whose belief in revelation was at most but doubtful; and a suspected infidel stood forward, and was recognised as the champion of Protestantism.

The vigour of Shaftesbury's opposition was immediately felt. Mindful of its success in the reign of Charles I., the opposition strove in the first place to increase the alarm of the nation, and then stood forth as the deplorers and avengers of its wrongs. Hence the late petition for a general fast; hence a second address begging the king, although the country was completely tranquil, to order all the Catholics who were not householders to remove to a distance of at least ten miles from London; hence too a third petition to order the militia of London and Westminster to be ready at an hour's notice, and that of the country at a day's notice, in order to suppress any tumultuous meetings, whether of Papists or of other discontented characters. These measures were followed by a violent invective against the ministers, and by a petition for the dismissal of Lauderdale and Buckingham.

Buckingham had not as yet given his support to the opposition. He, however, displayed so much submission by pleading at the bar of the Commons, by his apologies, by his treacherous accusations of Arlington, and by his dark insinuations against the royal brothers, that the petition against him was considerably modified. Charles however had grown suspicious of the duke; and the latter, finding himself discarded, became the public ally of the

Earl of Shaftesbury. Many others beside Buckingham feared the vengeance of James for their share in the prosecution of Clarendon, and were easily induced to follow the duke's example. By the operation of the recent Test Act, the enemies of James had already deprived him of the office of admiral, and had held him up to the nation as one who was unfit to wear the crown. Now they introduced a more comprehensive Test to remove him from parliament, and to forbid him to appear within five miles of the court. It was proposed in the Lords, at the same time, that none of the royal family should marry a Catholic, that the younger branches of the royal family, the eldest sons of peers, and all other Catholic children, if their fathers were deceased, should be brought up in the established religion. Twice did they attempt to accomplish their object, and the majorities against them in the Commons were so small, that James began to despair. A prorogation of parliament gave him time to watch and combat the designs of his enemies.

The latter anticipating a triumph began to look round for a successor to the crown. Some thought of the Duke of Monmouth, the king's natural son; and others of the Prince of Orange, who had married Mary, the daughter of James, and whose achievements against Louis XIV had won the applause of Europe. Neither Monmouth nor the Prince of Orange was devoid of ambition: both maintained a close correspondence with their respective English partisans. The former, by their advice, asked and obtained the office of Commander-in-Chief, which a few years before had been abolished, from its being supposed to give too dangerous a power to the subject. The plans of the Prince of Orange were bolder, but more secret. It was proposed that money should be sent from Holland to purchase the votes of the English parliament, and thus to force Charles to join the Dutch in a league against Louis; and it was at the same time insinuated, in a manner that William could hardly misunderstand, that if the design were adopted, he was to be prepared to take advantage of any subsequent movements.

To promote this object, pamphlets were circulated, dilating on the growth of Popery and arbitrary power; calling attention to the war on the Continent, which was to decide the fate of their religion and liberty; and summoning to arms for the annihilation of France. The logical truth of these invectives may be inferred from the fact, that

France, against which, as the great opponent of Protestantism, all the wrath of the people was thus directed, was at this time in alliance with the Protestant State of Sweden, against the two great Catholic powers of Austria and Spain!

These preliminaries were followed by Oates's plot, the origin and general progress of which are too well known to need a recapitulation.

"The Jesuits," said this unblushing miscreant, "the Jesuits were everywhere plotting the re-establishment of Catholicity by bloodshed and rebellion; in Ireland they were organizing a general insurrection, in Holland they were disseminating French maxims and French influence, in Scotland they opposed the Established Church in the disguise of Cameronians, in England their malice had already been felt; the great fire was their work, in that conflagration they had employed seven hundred fire-balls, and had carried off a thousand carats of diamonds, making a clear profit of £14,000, while in the fire of Southwark, (1676,) they had cleared £2000; their present object was to burn Westminster, Wapping, and the shipping in the river, and to shoot the King; the Pope was aware of the scheme, and had already selected the person that was to fill the English throne."

As if terrified at what they heard, and as if fearing another Gunpowder Plot, the Commons ordered guards to be placed in the cellars under the parliament house; compelled the king to proclaim that all Catholics who were not householders, should quit London; and conjured him to dismiss every Papist from his service, and to be careful that his meals were prepared by none but orthodox cooks. Committees of enquiry were appointed, and their management was left to the unremitting activity of Shaftesbury.

The malignant audacity of Oates increased with the credulity of his hearers. He now ventured to name those who were selected by the Pope for the offices of state. At the word of a man who had neither character nor property, the Lords were startled from their jealousy of privilege, and suffered the Commons to send to the Tower, the Earl of Powis, Viscount Stafford, and the Lords Petre, Arundel, and Belasyse.

The excitement was kept alive by the funeral of Sir Edmondbury Godfrey, falsely reported to have been mur-

dered by the catholics, and still more by the measures of the Government. For Danby, the prime minister, fearing an impeachment, sought his own safety by engrossing upon other subjects the whole attention of the opposition. Two thousand suspected traitors were thrown into prison, the houses of Catholics, not excepting that of the Earl Marshal, were rigorously searched for arms; and all who refused to take the oath of supremacy to the number of 30,000, were compelled to remove to a distance of at least ten miles from Whitehall. As if the excitement and confusion thus produced were not enough, posts were erected as if for the purpose of throwing chains across the streets upon the first alarm; the train-bands, volunteers and military, amounting in all to nearly 50,000 men, were occasionally ordered to remain all night under arms, numerous patrols moved along the streets, and batteries were thrown up for the defence of the palace.

While the nation was still in a ferment, it was worked up to a state of phrensy by the contrivances of the Green Ribbon Club. This club was formed of the leaders of the opposition, and held its meetings in the King's Arms Tavern, in what was then the fashionable neighbourhood of Temple Bar. It was published that a solemn procession at the expense of the club, was to celebrate the approaching anniversary of Elizabeth's accession. Accordingly, on the 17th of November, 200,000 persons were on the spot to witness the pageant. At the dusk of evening the expected procession formed by torch-light. First, a crier slowly advancing led the way, and proclaimed at intervals, "Remember Mr. Justice Godfrey." Immediately behind the crier, rode a person dressed in the habit of a Jesuit, and having before him, thrown over the horse's back, the figure of a dead body, meant for that of Godfrey. A long array dressed as monks, nuns, and cardinals, Catholic bishops in cope and mitre, and Protestant bishops in lawn sleeves, was closed by a litter containing an effigy of the Pope, and by his side as his adviser, the arch fiend himself. The excited spectators had already armed themselves with daggers against the designs of the "Papists," and had sworn against the latter eternal hatred; but when they had heard the solemn voice of the crier, and had seen the mysterious array of ghost-like forms under the baleful glare of the torches, and still more when they had seen the Pope's effigy hurled into the flames amidst a burst of fire-

works, they separated with their bosoms rankling with every bitter if not malignant feeling, that could gratify the heart, or forward the schemes of their wily deceiver.

Shaftesbury and his party calculated that if a parliament were to be held during the continuance of the excitement, they would be able to achieve a complete triumph. They had, therefore, already divided the country into districts, and in each district had organised a committee to get up petitions for summoning the parliament. It happened, (and the contingency had doubtlessly been anticipated,) that the licensing act expired at this very time, (May 1679.) At once, therefore, the press teemed with virulent writings of every description. The judges interfered, but Shaftesbury's object was already gained; Charles was ever beset with petitions. It was of no use that he answered that it was his province to appoint the time for parliamentary business, he was still incessantly and often most unseasonably way-laid and loaded with a multitude of similar petitions. The grand juries, the corporations, the common council of London, and nearly all the towns and counties vied with one another in urging the same importunate request. Charles now grew alarmed, and having provided trusty garrisons at Sheerness, Portsmouth, Hull, and other fortresses, he denounced rigorous punishment against all that should subscribe a petition contrary to the common and known laws of the land. This proclamation aroused the dormant loyalty of the people. But a little before, the king seemed almost alone, and was brooding despondingly on the gloomy future; now, however, all the lovers of monarchy were raising their voices from every part of the kingdom, and were crowding around the king to offer at once allegiance and aid. The nobles, the greater part of the gentry, the merchants, and multitudes of the middle and lower classes, poured in their loyal addresses, and declared their abhorrence of the late petitions. The king's enemies shrunk at this rallying cry of all England, and their confusion was as great as their former exultation.

Thus closed the first of this unparalleled series of plots. At the height of the popular frenzy, James had been requested to leave the country until the storm should have blown over. He refused to quit his post, but yielded to the commands of his brother. He resided first in Holland and afterwards in Scotland. His faithful duchess could not be kept from his side, even by the care of her infant child.

The popularity of both in Scotland was almost boundless, and so indeed it might well be, if one half of what is told of them be true.

"While in Scotland, James applied himself zealously to business, and with his usual regard for economy, detected and put a stop to many of the peculations and abuses of the duke of Lauderdale's creatures, whereby he incurred the ill-will of that corrupt statesman, and his duchess, and many of their connections. He bestowed his attention on the maritime and commercial interests of Scotland, all of which were materially improved during his residence in that nation. Such were the feelings which the residence and popular government of the duke of York had excited in the kindred land of his forefathers, that there can be little doubt if he had been rejected by England, but that he would have been instantly proclaimed and crowned in Scotland."—pp. 134, 135.

"The sailor prince, being a friend to ancient customs, encouraged the citizens and mechanics of the good town to take a share in these manly sports and pastimes, and for this end he always chose his partner at golf from these classes.

"The oral traditions of Edinburgh record the following instance of the frank and gracious conduct of the duke of York to one of his humble allies at the golf. His royal highness and the duke of Lauderdale, who were both expert golfers, generally engaged on opposite sides, and one day, they determined to play for an unusually high stake. James called a working shoemaker, named John Paterson, to second him, and after a very hard contest, defeated his antagonist. When the duke of Lauderdale paid the stake which is said to have been some hundreds of broad pieces, his royal highness handed the gold to Paterson with these words, 'Through your skill I have won this game, and you are therefore entitled to the reward of the victory;' the princely courtesy of the compliment being a trait of more refined generosity than the princely munificence of the gift; and dear, we may be sure, were both to the heart of the bonnie Scot, who had seconded the brother of his sovereign so stoutly on the links of Leith that day.

"Notwithstanding his popery, James was at that period one of the finest gentlemen in Europe."—p. 124.

Amidst the reaction against Shaftesbury, which had been provoked by his system of petitions, James was recalled to London by his brother, and was welcomed by the acclamations of the people.

His enemies, however, were not yet discouraged. The tale of the black box, containing the pretended marriage-settlement of King Charles and Lucy Barlow, the mother of Monmouth, was scarcely exploded, when rumours and

depositions of presbyterian plots alarmed the credulous multitude. When these, and even the "popish meal-tub plot" had passed (and not without effect), preparations were made for a more immediate attack upon the Duke of York. These preparations were facilitated by a strange conjuncture of affairs. Louis knew that Charles had just formed a league with Spain, and by his liberal distribution of gold he encouraged the opposition to plot for the Prince of Orange, and thus to embarrass to the utmost their country's government. It was not enough that Hampden, Algernon Sidney, Buckingham, and many others, who talked loudly of their disinterested patriotism, should become the hirelings of France and Holland; but even Godolphin and Sunderland, afterwards so famous for their share in the "glorious revolution," and at this moment ministers of Charles and high in his confidence, were deeply involved in the intrigues of the French and Dutch envoys, and had pledged themselves to promote the bill for the exclusion of James.

To obtain the consent of Charles was the next object. To effect this the Duchess of Portsmouth, one of the king's mistresses, was threatened with an impeachment. When the wretched woman was sufficiently intimidated, they offered to forego the charge, provided she would influence Charles in favour of the bill. She made a compact for this purpose with Shaftesbury, Russell, and Monmouth; and that she might have power over the royal will, she was empowered to make the king an offer of a large sum of money and of the power to nominate his successor.

The Duke of York was now again in Scotland, in obedience to his brother's commands; but his enemies still sought to compass his ruin. When parliament had assembled, Dangerfield, an informer of unenviable notoriety, whose testimony had been scorned by three successive juries, was allowed to stand at the bar of the commons and prefer against James a charge of plotting against his brother's life. He must have reckoned largely on the credulity or hypocrisy of the members, but he had not reckoned amiss. The whole house appeared in a ferment, and Russell moved, that it should be their first care "effectually to suppress popery, and prevent a popish successor." A storm of invective against the "papists" followed; every evil that had befallen the country during the whole reign was their work. As a fitting close to so truthful a denun-

ciation, Oates and his brother informers, Prance, Faria, and Treby, the personifications of truth, now strided forward, and told the grave, or rather excited, senators, their labyrinth of detected conspiracies. It was voted that all these plots had been formed because the Duke of York was a papist; that if anything happened to the king, it should be revenged upon the whole body of Catholics; and, lastly, that a bill should be introduced for excluding James from the throne of England.

Baffled in their attempt by the exertions of Charles, the opposition presented a nominal address to the king, the real object of which was to exasperate the people by renewing the cry against the Jesuits. Their efforts were in great measure successful; but their want of moderation produced a reaction. Their impeachment and legal murder of the aged Lord Stafford aroused all the fanaticism of the mob, and even the parliament were not ashamed to greet the capital charge of Dangerfield with a shout of exultation! The patience of the gray-headed baron under the yells and execrations of the mob, and the cruelty and injustice of the heartless men upon the bench must have touched every heart that was not utterly callous. Stafford's speech upon the scaffold triumphed over prejudice and every other feeling, and called forth from the vast assemblage of Londoners one loud and unanimous testimony to his innocence: "We believe you, my lord! God bless you, my lord!" But there is not now in our constitution any power that may stand between an unjust sentence and its victim. Stafford's blood was streaming from the block almost at the moment that the cry of his innocence was rising to heaven.

The reaction which had thus been produced was not immediately felt, and the faction of Shaftesbury pursued their schemes with ardour. Godolphin, Sunderland, the Duchess of Portsmouth, and even the Prince of Orange, successively urged the king to come to an understanding with his parliament. The Spanish ambassador came next, alluded to the designs of Louis, and lamented that England should waste its strength in internal dissension, forgetful both of its own interests and of those of its allies. Then came the Dutch ambassadors with a long and elaborate memorial, declaring boldly that Charles had sacrificed the welfare of Europe, of all the Protestant powers, and particularly of the United Provinces, for so uncertain a

thing as a future succession: The tone of this memorial destroyed the effect of the whole scheme; Charles's indignation overcame his indolence, and he answered the remonstrants with a brief refusal.

The majority of the commons still supported Shaftesbury; and after a variety of arbitrary measures, they passed the alarming resolution, "that unless the Duke of York were excluded, there would be no safety for the king, government, or Protestant religion; that the Marquis of Worcester, the Earls of Halifax and Clarendon, the advisers of the late answer, and the Earl of Feverham, were promoters of popery; and that any one who should lend money to the king on any branch of the revenue should be adjudged to hinder the sitting of parliament, and should be made responsible for the same."

To weaken the opposition a new parliament was called, not to London, but to Oxford. Escorted by his life-guards Charles proceeded to the latter city to open the parliament. Shaftesbury, the representatives of the city, and the leaders of the opposition in the commons, followed in arms, surrounded by bands of armed men, who wore on their hats a ribbon inscribed with the words, "No popery! No slavery!"

To mollify his opponents Charles offered to agree that James should enjoy the title without the power of a king; that the government, during the whole of his life, should be administered by all. The offer was refused; a greater triumph was anticipated. A Scotchman and an Irish Protestant had lately dared to charge the king himself with a participation in the recent plots. These wretches were now introduced by the commons; and it was evident that they were going to act the part of Dangerfield.

The design was baffled by the unusual promptitude of the king. He dissolved the parliament, and hurried to Windsor with such precipitation, that it was rumoured that he had discovered a conspiracy, and fled for his life; there can be little doubt that the dissolution averted a civil war.

The king's declarations of his reasons for the two last dissolutions were answered by numerous loyal addresses. The reaction which had begun at the death of Stafford was now complete. The delirium was over: the plot was reconsidered, disbelieved, and condemned.

The time-serving informers now turned against their

former employers. Nor were the ministers upright enough to reject their perjured testimony: honour and truth were still sacrificed to revenge. Several executions followed; and Shaftesbury, after skulking in various hiding-places in London, and vainly summoning the people to arms, fled to Holland.

Baffled thus a second time, the opponents of the government became outrageous. The more violent proposed the assassination of the royal brothers. Whitehall, the theatre, and the Rye House, a lonely farm-house on the road between Newmarket and London, were successively pointed out as places well adapted for the purpose. The most active conspirator was Lord Howard of Escrick. The Duke of Monmouth, the Earl of Essex, the Lords Grey and Russell, Algernon Sidney, and Mr. Hampden, consented to the plot, but not to the assassination. They wished to extort the royal consent to their proposals by a general rising in the city, in several counties, and in Scotland. Argyle had asked Shaftesbury for £30,000 towards the attempt; but Shaftesbury's turbulent career was drawing to a close, he expired about two months after his arrival in Holland.

Before Argyle could despatch the stipulated arms and ammunition to the conspirators, the arrest at Newcastle of a Scot, who was the bearer of a suspicious letter, excited the alarm of the government. Soon after one of the accomplices offered to reveal the plot. Several persons were arrested. Lord Howard became the accuser of his associates. Russell and Sydney died on the scaffold, and Essex committed suicide.

This third defeat of James's enemies was followed by the sudden death of Charles, and the peaceable accession of his brother. The latter might now appear secure. Yet his enemies were still at work, sometimes openly, and sometimes secretly, until they plucked the crown from his head. Their first efforts were displayed in the rebellions of Monmouth and Argyle; but they soon paid the penalty of rebellion. The unfeeling severity with which Jeffreys visited those that were engaged in the rebellion enabled the enemies of James to throw the whole fault upon the king. Let us hear Miss Strickland upon this point:

"It has been assumed by some historians, that James was cognizant of all Jeffreys' merciless proceedings, because there was a

constant correspondence between the latter and Sunderland, and Sunderland's letters contain assurances, 'that the king approved and thanked Jeffreys for his zeal in his service;' but this appears only one of the links in Sunderland's extensive chain of treachery. He and his friend Jeffreys played into each other's hands, and amassed enormous sums by the sale of pardons to the wealthy—a species of traffic of which Rochester and Father Petre are also accused. It is a notorious fact that Jeffreys, who was always in a state of exasperation of temper from bodily torture, and the irritability caused by habitual intemperance, scrupled not to set the king's authority at naught by hanging old Major Holmes, notwithstanding the royal grace had been extended to him. Jeffreys pretended that it was an accident; so, according to Queen Elizabeth, was the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots. The barbarities of Jeffreys were lamented by the king, when the whole truth was made known to him by two courageous and noble-minded men, Sir Thomas Cutler, the commanding officer at Wells, and the good Bishop Kenn, who made a personal appeal to the monarch himself in behalf of some of the victims. James not only listened to their representations, but thanked Sir Thomas Cutler publicly for what he had done, and expressed a wish that others had imitated his humanity.

"Among the prisoners, whose case came under the personal attention of the king, was the popular orator, Story, who had endeavoured to excite the indignation of the people against his majesty, by repeating in very inflammatory language all the libellous accusations that had been set forth in Monmouth's proclamation. The incident being recorded by a violent nonconformist, Edmund Calamy, is not liable to suspicion of *over*-partiality to the sovereign. 'When Story, taken and imprisoned for assisting Monmouth, was ordered before the king and privy-council, of a sudden the keeper declared his orders were to bring him immediately, which he did in a coach, without giving him any time to prepare himself in any manner, only cautioning him to give a plain and direct answer to the questions King James might put to him. When brought before the privy-council, Story made so sad and sorrowful a figure that all present were surprised and affrighted at his haggard and squalid appearance. When King James first cast his eyes upon him, he cried out, "Is that a man, or what is it?" His majesty was told it was the rebel Story. "Oh! Story," said the king, "I remember him—that is a rare fellow, indeed!" Then, turning towards him, "Pray, Story," said he, "you were in Monmouth's army in the west—were you not?" He, according to the advice given him, made answer presently, "Yes, an't please your majesty." "Pray," said the king to him, "you were a commissary there, were you not?" Again Story replied, "Yes, an't please your majesty." "And you," said King James, "made a speech before great crowds of people, did you not?" He again very readily

answered, "Yes, an't please your majesty." "Pray," said King James, "if you have not forgot what you said, let us have some taste of your fine speech,—let us have some specimen of some of the flowers of your rhetoric." Whereupon, resumes Edmund Calamy, 'Story told us that he readily made answer, "I told, an't please your majesty, that it was you that fired the city of London." "A rare rogue, upon my word," said the king; "and, pray, what else did you tell them?" "I told them, an't please your majesty, that you poisoned your brother." "Impudence in the utmost height of it," said King James; "pray, let's have something further, if your memory serve you." "I further told them," said Mr. Story, "that your majesty appeared fully determined to make the nation both papists and slaves." "A rogue with a witness!" and, cutting off short, the king rejoined, "But what would you say, Story, if, after all this, I were to grant you your life?" To which he without any demur made answer, that he would pray for his majesty as long as he lived. "Why, then," said the king, "I freely pardon all that is past, and hope that you will not for the future represent your king as inexorable." " pp. 181, 183.

Whatever James's motives and feelings, his enemies were closely observing him, careful to diminish his popularity to the utmost. Too many opportunities did he afford them by his injudicious measures; but it was not the suspension of the penal laws, nor the imprisonment of the bishops that led to his deposition: it was a continuation of the former plots for his exclusion which, after having been three times defeated, now at last succeeded. The conspirators were supported by all the influence of Anne and Mary, the daughters of James. Seeing themselves debarred the English crown by the birth of a brother, they fabricated a story that the child was a low-born babe that had been introduced into the royal bed-chamber in a warming-pan; and, in their pretended indignation at the imposture, gave all their influence to the Prince of Orange.

With a Dutch fleet of sixty sail of the line, and an army of 16,000 men, William arrived at last at Torbay. Although astonished at the treachery of several of his most trusted friends, James was consoled by the evident loyalty of the majority, and moved forward to encounter the invaders. A violent effusion of blood from his nose, such as afterwards reduced him to the grave, rendered him inactive at the most critical moment, perplexed his friends, and encouraged the conspirators to unfurl in several places at once the standard of rebellion.

It was almost too late for a forward movement; and now, when James returned to his capital, he was stricken to the earth by the unexpected tidings of the treason of Anne. "God help me," he exclaimed, while the tears fell from his eyes, "my very children have forsaken me!" For two or three days the shock affected his brain; and now indeed it seemed too late. The Dutch troops were soon embattled around Whitehall; the Lord Craven's indignant sword was reluctantly sheathed; and James, surrounded by foreign bayonets, quitted London amid the tears and lamentations of the spectators, and with his queen and child was soon an exile in France.

The portion of the volume that tells of this, their last banishment, is of touching interest. It closes with the last days and the death of James, the bereavement and resignation of Mary, and the first measures of Louis in behalf of their son. We will close our notice with a brief extract from this mournful period of Mary's life:

"The conversation turning on death, the king expressed so much desire for that event, that the queen was much distressed. 'Alas!' said she, with tears in her eyes, 'what would become of me and your little ones, if we were deprived of you!' 'God,' he replied, 'will take care of you and our children: for what am I but a poor, feeble man, incapable of doing anything without Him?' Mary Beatrice, whose heart was full, went to the table to conceal her emotion by pretending to look for a book. The assistant, (the incident took place at a convent,) who tenderly loved the queen, softly approached the king, and said to him, 'We humbly entreat your majesty not to speak of your death to the queen, for it always afflicts her.' 'I do so, to prepare her for that event,' replied James, 'since it is a thing which in the course of nature must soon occur, and it is proper to accustom her to the certainty of it.' The assistant said to the queen, when they were alone, 'Madame, I have taken the liberty of begging the king not to talk of death to your majesty to make you sad.' The queen smiled, and said, 'It will not trouble me any more. He is accustomed to talk to me about it very often, and, above all, I am sure it will not accelerate his death a single moment.'"—p. 346.

ART. VIII.—*Letters to M. Gondon, on the Destructive Character of the Church of Rome, both in Religion and Polity.* By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D. D., Canon of Westminster. Second Edition. London: 1847.

A CLASSICAL scholar meddling with theology, is one of the most pitiful and piteous phenomena in the whole world of literature. Somehow or other such persons are singularly disqualified for what they have so rashly undertaken, the tone of authority which they assume making their performances absolutely ridiculous. Dr. Wordsworth is a scholar, he may be something more, but at present there is no evidence for it. His position in the Anglican establishment gives him leisure for writing, we wish it had given him leisure for reading. The divines of the communion to which he belongs, have never shown depth of thought nor extensive learning, except perhaps in one instance, and he was a neglected predecessor of Dr. Wordsworth in the Abbey of Westminster, but not a monk. Dr. Wordsworth has confidence in his cause, and a supply of passages to make it good, but is not at all scrupulous as to the real meaning of his quotations; he gives them a meaning himself, and that one as far removed from that of the writer whom he cites as it can possibly be. Having no time for a more particular observation of these letters, which we find now in a second edition, we confine ourselves to the bare exposing of blunders, which we are afraid our readers will give us credit for inventing, rather than suppose Dr. Wordsworth guilty of such dulness as to have committed them himself. We shall in pursuance of our purpose set down Dr. Wordsworth's own words, and then as briefly as we possibly can, correct his misrepresentations.

"Cardinal Bellarmine says, 'if the Pope should so far err as to command vices and to prohibit virtues, the Church would be bound to believe that vices are good and virtues are evil; unless she will sin against her conscience.'"—p. 63.

This is not the first time we have heard of this misrepresentation; we wish we could think that Dr. Wordsworth may be its last promulgator. The passage translated in the text is given in a note, with accurate reference to the treatise of Bellarmine, *De Pontifice*, iv. 5, and indeed the

words are correctly cited. We hope that Dr. Wordsworth never read the chapter from which he quotes, but that he has taken his authorities on trust. The words he has produced are half a sentence, and are really the conclusion that follows from an hypothesis contrary to that which Bellarmine maintained. His argument may be given in substance thus: "if the Pope were not infallible in matters of faith and morals, he might command people to believe what is false, and practice what is evil; and as the Church is ever bound to obey the Pope, she would then be bound to believe virtue to be vice, and vice virtue." Dr. Wordsworth cannot have a greater horror of such a dereliction of duty than all Catholics have, and the Cardinal always expressed. What would Dr. Wordsworth say of us if we were to charge him with the following opinion which we give in his own words, p. 49. "The infidel might justly assert that all our religion is a mere ψιλή πίστις, a bare groundless faith." We have done with his book only what he has done with that of Bellarmine, suppressed the hypothetical clause.

"It is expressly said that the superior may bind the members of the society to commit *mortal sin*," p. 65. It requires no effort on the part of Protestants to believe this of the Jesuits; but we are surprised at the hardihood of Dr. Wordsworth, who has actually cited in a note the constitutions of the society, to prove so wicked and groundless a charge. The note is as follows: Pars. vi. c. 5. "The constitutions are *not* to bind to mortal sin, NISI superior *id* in nomine, D. N. J. C.....juberet." We do not cite the whole of course, for the rest is not relevant; we print the word *id* in italics, for a reason that will appear by and by. The title of the chapter which Dr. Wordsworth quotes from, is *Quod constitutiones peccati obligationem non inducunt*; that is, the constitutions do not bind under pain of sin, which is a very different thing.

It is therein expressly provided, that excepting the four vows, all declarations and ordinances if not duly observed, do not involve him who fails therein in the guilt of mortal or venial sin—*peccatum mortale vel veniale*—unless the superior should enforce those declarations and ordinances in the name of God, or in virtue of obedience. Dr. Wordsworth has here misquoted his authority, he has the word *id* after *superior*, and refers it to mortal sin; for without that change the accusation could not be sustained: whereas

the text has *ea*, referring to the constitutions of the society. But what shall we say of the learning of a man who cannot read Latin, or of his honesty who cites his documents untruly?

“‘Vain is the labour,’ said Cardinal Hosius, a Papal legate and president at the Council of Trent, ‘which is spent on Holy Scripture, for Scripture is but a creature and a beggarly element.’ And Ludovicus, a canon of the Lateran, in a speech at the same Council, ‘Scripture is only lifeless ink.’ And Pighius, in his third book of Controversies, calls it ‘a mute judge, a *nose of wax*, which allows itself to be pulled this way and that, and to be moulded into any form you please.’”—p. 74.

Will Dr. Wordsworth say that these expressions are used in contempt of Scripture, or that their authors undervalued the holy writings and ridiculed their contents? if he cannot, or dare not, what do these expressions prove against those who used them, or the Church whose devoted children they were? If Hosius, Ludovicus, and Pighius, were irreverent men and trifled with holy things, or wrote about what they did not understand, such language coming from them is liable to grave censure; it will prove nothing for Dr. Wordsworth's purpose to cite these and like sayings, unless he can also show the writers to have been influenced by a spirit of irreverence, which he so deliberately insinuates against them.

First, we begin with Pighius. He wrote thus:

“But as there is no passage of Scripture so plain or clear as to defend itself from the wrong-dealings of heretics, who adulterate, wrest and pervert the Scriptures to their own sense. For these are—as some one no less truly than wittily observed—like a nose of wax which may be twisted every way; and like a leaden rule which is made to bend to what shape one pleases. To these (the Scriptures) we must apply not a rule of lead and one equally flexible, but one strong and unbending, that column, that foundation of the truth, I mean the common understanding and sentence of the Catholic Church.”—Lib. iii. c. 3.

Does this sound like contempt? is it not clear that to the heretics and to their treatment of Scripture the expression is to be applied, and not to the estimation in which Pighius held the sacred writings? We are even confident enough to ask Dr. Wordsworth himself, whether he can find fault with the expression now; we are certain of this,

the High Anglican party will adopt the whole passage readily.

Ludovicus is the next. Dr. Wordsworth does not give any reference to the place where his words may be found, which leaves us to suppose that he has taken his quotations on the authority of another; we have been at the pains to find them,* and shall now present them with their context.

"That I may pass by that most important and clear saying of blessed Paul, in which he warned the Thessalonians and others who practised christian piety, to stand to and hold fast, not the writings, not the volumes, not the books, but 'the traditions which they had learned, whether by word of mouth or by writing.' For that holy teacher, who had been taken up into the third heaven and heard secret words which no man may speak, knew that the Church of God was the living breast of Christ, but the Scripture as it were dead ink—*quasi mortuum atramentum*—and therefore we must rather believe the living breast than dead ink, that is, greater faith is to be given to the living Church than to books, which in themselves, are as dead things. He knew, too, that Christ did not leave books, writings, instruments, or muniments to His disciples, but examples, precepts, ways of life and commandments." And a little further on he speaks of the "books of divine authority."

Does this sound as if Ludovicus disregarded Scripture? On the contrary, it could have been written only by one most jealous for its due veneration, and the preservation of its uncorrupted sense.

Hosius comes next in our order, and the charge against him we dispose of by saying, that Dr. Wordsworth has cited as his words, what Hosius really considers the heretics to say to their new teachers. Hosius introduces the words with this preface: "They have begun to have such thoughts as these. How long shall we endure this tyranny of these apostate monks?" *Excucullatorum istorum tyrannidem*. Soon after these words occur those cited by Dr. Wordsworth, who he might have seen, if he had not been purposely blind, that Hosius is not answerable for the sentence he quotes from him; for in the margin of the very edition he has used are these words, *hæreticorum argumenta ridicula*.

The great Cardinal has furnished Dr. Wordsworth with much matter for condemnation. His words are alleged, separated from their context, and made to bear a substan-

* Colet. Concil. Tom. xx. Col. 1143.

tive meaning, when they are used only in relation to others. He has dealt as unfairly by him as he would do who should say, that we attributed divine honours to the queen because we speak of her as "her majesty." We produce now a very extraordinary passage from p. 150 :

"Nay more, not only does she thus render the Word of God of none effect, but she even ascribes His oracles to the dictation of the Evil One. Cardinal Hosius says, 'That which the Church (of Rome) teaches is the express word of God, and that which is held contrary to the sense and consent of the Church, is the express word of the Devil.' So that if we believe that Christ commands us to receive in both kinds, saying, 'Drink ye all of this, and except ye drink my blood ye have no life in you,' as the Church of Rome herself once taught and practised, we should obey Satan and not God."

This passage represents Dr. Wordsworth's understanding of Hosius; and he has quoted in his notes the passages he alludes to. The Cardinal, in his tract *de expresso Dei Verbo*, observes upon the practice of heretics always quoting Scripture, but in a sense altogether their own. The devil, he says, quoted Scripture to our Lord, but in a sense that was impious and profane: so the heretics are ever ready with phrases of Scripture, but used by them in a bad sense, as the devil did when he tempted our Lord. As the devil then cited the very words of Scripture, so do his members now by means of Scriptural sayings labour to persuade christians to throw themselves away from the protection of the Church. "What the Church teaches," he says, "is the word of God;" what is contrary to her teaching, even if it be in the very words of Scripture, is the teaching of Satan himself. He further shows, that the practice of communion in both kinds was clamoured for, not because it was the command of Christ, but through contempt of the Church, and in defiance of her authority. "The Church commanded to receive in one kind; Satan in both." This is the substance of the words of Hosius, and Dr. Wordsworth has used them as if the Cardinal held the communion in both kinds as the work of Satan. It is this perversion that we complain of. So far is the Cardinal from disliking absolutely such communion, that he has said in this very tract that it might be permitted; and it is because men clamoured for the cup in a wicked and rebellious spirit, that he says Satan

desired it. Dr. Wordsworth might have known this: we really are almost compelled to believe that he has deliberately misunderstood the place he quotes, which is this: "It is the rule or custom of Christ's body, the Church, that we communicate under one kind; his [Satan] under both. It is the rule or custom of Christ's body, the Church, that we communicate under both kinds; his, either under one or neither." Who but Dr. Wordsworth could have failed to see that the Cardinal is putting two conditions before us, with neither of which Satan would have been satisfied? The object of heretics being, not communion in both kinds, but the destruction of the Church; for how can we ever believe that they were sincere in desiring the cup, when they were destroying the priesthood by which alone the Sacrament could be had?

In pp. 147, 148, we have this: "Pope Gelasius condemned the practice of *half-communion* as sacrilegious." For this assertion he quotes Gratian, *de cons.* ii. 12. *Comperimus*. We find it impossible to explain upon what principle Dr. Wordsworth reads books. The title of the canon he quotes, and the gloss upon it, forbid us to read it as he has done. The canon forbids the priest to abstain from receiving the cup, and that abstinence it calls a "great sacrilege." It is the celebrant the canon condemns, not the lay-communicant; and the rule of the Church is no more condemned by it than it is by the statute of mortmain or the reform-bill.

Page 281, in a note, Dr. Wordsworth says, "One of the decrees of the Council of Constance is, that 'faith is not to be kept with heretics to the prejudice of the Church.' (Sess. 19.)" To this we give a flat denial, and defy any one, except the Canon of Westminster, to explain that decree to mean anything but that faith *must* be kept with heretics and all others to whom it is given.

Page 314. "No Romanist archbishop can consecrate a church, or confirm a child, without receiving the *Pallium* from Rome." This assertion Dr. Wordsworth supports by a quotation from the Pontifical, and the words which he considers equivalent to "confirm a child" are *chrisma conficere*, which mean, not confirmation, but the blessing of the oils, on Maundy Thursday. Such is the learning of a man who writes a book of more than 300 pages on the destructive character of the Church of Rome!

We conclude our ungrateful labours with a historical inaccuracy of our scholar, which may be found in p. 285, where he says, "that the Pope not only indirectly deprived Louis XVIII. of his crown, but that he *placed it with his own hands on the head of Napoleon.*" It is very well known that Buonaparte saved the pope this trouble; for, says M. Thiers, he "*saisit la couronne des mains du Pontife, sans brusquerie, mais avec décision, et la plaça lui-même sur sa tête.*" (Hist. du Consulat. liv. 20. tom. v. p. 266. Paris, 1845.)

In his first edition of these Letters he gave extracts from a document purporting to be a confession of faith propounded to converts in Hungary. In the second he gives the whole document. Dr. Wordsworth considers it genuine, or he does not; that is all we shall say on this point. He describes it in these words: "The following document is a public and an authoritative one; it has even taken its place among the 'Symbolical Books' of the Church of Rome, and I cite it from one of the most recent editions of the dogmatical collections of that Church." (p. 68.) He then gives his extracts, which are in themselves evidence enough of the forgery, one of them being this, "that they who communicate *in both kinds receive nothing but bare bread,*" which is simply an absurdity. Dr. Wordsworth says that this confession has authority, and "has even taken its place among the Symbolical Books of the Church of Rome." The Church of Rome has no "Symbolical Books." That is a Lutheran possession; and if a Protestant chooses to print our canons and catechism, and call them Symbolical Books, we have no help for it: if people will force principles upon us which we abhor, we must submit. In the advertisement to the second edition of his book Dr. Wordsworth tells us, that these Symbolical Books were "edited by two learned members of that Church, Streitwolf and Klener." Whether Streitwolf was a Catholic, or not, matters little; he had nothing to do with editing this confession. Klener calls him "a minister of the Word." He died in 1836. Klener published what Streitwolf had collected, and added to them the whole of the second volume, where this confession is found; and there is no evidence that Streitwolf ever saw it, or knew of its existence. Klener's religion is not very clear; he seems upon the whole to belong to Bunsen's "Church of the Future," to which, or some-

thing like it, he dedicates his book, published two years after Streitwolf's death. But what makes the whole affair ridiculous is this, that this confession was drawn up, it is said, by the Jesuits. It seems to be the satirical composition of a Protestant, or of a Catholic representing the Protestant's apprehensions of the Catholic religion: at all events it represents Dr. Wordsworth's.*

Page 147. "It is the practice of the Church of Rome to celebrate the festival of the immaculate conception of the Virgin, and therefore original sin is no longer, in her case at least, an article of faith, but the contrary." Now, what can such a sentence as this mean? does our belief in the immaculate conception of the Virgin-Mother interfere with the doctrine of original sin? If it does not—and who will say that it does?—such writing as this can have no other issue but the stirring up of the spirit of reviling and blasphemy. It might as well be said, that our belief in the removal of Enoch denies the fact that we must all die. It is almost despairing to see such a work as this arrive at a second edition, and to hear of its being recommended by estimable and amiable people. Surely, if the Anglican communion be in the right, it has no reason for calumniating. If it must be defended, why should it have recourse to untrue accusations against its enemies? If the Catholic Church be a lie, let those who think so abstain from lies themselves. We ask for justice and truth; our books are open, our churches too, let people see and judge whether we are so wicked and abandoned of all grace as our enemies represent us to be. Let them act upon their own principle of judging for themselves, and not listen to

* As an illustration of the learned Canon's temper, we give an extract from this Confession in his own version: "We confess that the most holy Pontiff ought to be honoured by all with divine honour (*honorari divino honore*), with more prostration than what is due to Christ Himself." We should have thought it much safer to translate it thus: "with the greater genuflection, due to Christ Himself"—*majori cum genuflectione, ipsi Christo debita*. The Doctor's own version is doubtless more fitted for his purpose, though in disregard of grammatical laws. Did he leave out the 17th clause because it was overlooked? It is this: "We confess that the Blessed Virgin Mary is worthy of greater honour from angels and men than Christ Himself, the Son of God;" or would the insertion of this clause make the forgery too transparent even in Exeter Hall?

pompous and pedantic writers, who through wickedness or weakness will not understand what we say. Dr. Wordsworth demands our pity and our prayers: he labours in a miserable work, and in these letters has committed more blunders than we have exposed. He believes the Pope to be Antichrist (pp. 242, 300), and, consequently, the Catholic Church to be the body of Satan; and yet dare not be consistent enough to call on M. Gondon or any other foreigner to leave the communion, which, on his principles, must carry all its members to everlasting ruin. Anglican divines have opinions, and propound theories, but they have no grasp of truth: they shrink from their own conclusions as soon as they have uttered the premises, and make strong assertions, but they do not, cannot believe what they say.

ART. IX.—“*The Nation's Guide to Scripture;*” a Sermon preached at Chippenham, July 13, 1846, at the Visitation of the Venerable Thomas Thorp, B. D., Archdeacon of Bristol. By the REV. JOHN EDWARD JACKSON, M. A., of Brasenose College, Oxford; Rector of Leigh-Delamere, Wiltshire. London, Rivington, 1846.

Whatever attempts may have been made by Anglicans to raise up a theory in defence of the authority of their own Church, it is certain that the majority of them regard Scripture as the sole rule of faith, and resent the introduction of any other authority as an insult to the dignity of that rule. Still, a sermon like that prefixed to this article, does moot the question of some standing guide to the Scripture,—a question the importance of which some of those to whom it was delivered must feel to be very vital, though all mention of the Catholic Church as that guide be avoided, and in its place is substituted a name more grateful to ears that hate the Pope, to wit, that of “the Established Ministry of the Church.” The reason of this substitution is, that the Church, which is the *living* promulgatrix of the books, and the books themselves, are assumed to be testimonies adverse the one to the other: hence as the Scriptures were to be retained, the only definite ‘guide’ to them was rejected. The assumption of

such contrariety between the two, obviously rendered this rejection necessary; and a most unsettled state of belief amongst Anglicans has thus been the natural consequence of that assumption.

The fact is, that men inadequately acquainted with theology and the depths of Scripture language, are yet very unwilling to submit to any suspense of judgment. A habit of hasty judgment springs up in the place of this patient suspense: hence when abstruse positions, such as theology inevitably contains, are presented to the mind, if it fails to see clear Scripture warrant for them, it pronounces them untenable, and uses them as reasons against paying reverence to the authority of the Church. There is nothing left in a mind of this sort to secure the Church a hearing: and it therefore takes refuge in Scripture as a rule of faith, perfectly assured that *there* it will find in all doubtful cases a shelter for any variety of opinion which may please its own capricious judgment.

The Church, on the other hand, speaks definitively upon controverted points, and when she has spoken she is standing close by, as being a living body, to see that her sentence is neither evaded nor misunderstood. A book like the Scripture, written so long ago, by authors so differently educated, and upon subjects so diversified, cannot but be open to mistakes and to sophistry of almost infinite variety. When the authors themselves, the apostles and evangelists, are no longer alive to defend themselves against such contrivances, what then hinders a man, who has once thrown off his respect for those who inherited their authority, from making whatever use of their writings he pleases? which are thus found, from the diversity of their matter and their unprotectedness, to be a very welcome refuge for false teachers and unbelievers against the stringent control of the Church's direct reproof, as Mr. Jackson tells his congregation in the following sentence (p. 10) of his Sermon:

"The ulterior object of the more designing part is; that under shelter, and by the aid, of this plausibly-sounding principle, they may by and by persuade the people of this country to discard that particular spiritual authority and teaching, which, apostolically derived, the legislature acknowledges and upholds: in short, to get rid of the *Established Ministry of the Church*."

How serviceable for them it is made to be, we see from

facts; for while true and faithful observants of orthodox truth are generally silent upon such matters, as having no need to parade their respect for Scripture, which, as long as they adhere to the Church, can never be questioned; on the other hand it is frequently found that an encomium upon the Bible is used as a prelude to some attack on Christian doctrine, or to the broaching of some licentious philosophy.

Thus, there is every reason for a latitudinarian to prefer the name of Scripture to that of the Church, as his professed guide, in order that he may rid himself of any allegiance to the Church at all; and this is a course that may be readily defended, if any blame appear attached for having forsaken the Church doctrine. This step may be called a conscientious abandonment of cold forms and of dry notions, while the charge of irreverence may be easily met by an appearance of submission to the other testimony, the Bible; which, by taking care to mention always by its most honourable titles, as "The Word of God," "The inspired Volume," "The Fountain-head," and the like, may give a semblance of deference to sacred things, and may cover the design of undermining its teaching. Thus, under an appearance of modesty there has been insinuated a notion of opponency between the two; a high respect for the Bible having been kept up, the Church is thrown into an appearance of variance with "God's word," and that the more, the more the Scripture is praised. And then every well deserved commendation of Scripture is looked upon as so much gained against the Church; and every respectful deference to the sense of the Church's received faith is construed into so much encroachment upon Scripture: so that, instead of being looked upon as the bulwark and home of Scripture, she is made to wear the appearance of a witness of suspected credibility, nay, as a culprit, which has to answer for its offences against the other witness, the Scripture.

Thus the Church's voice, reproving for any aberration from the right and safe rule of faith, is got rid of, and not allowed to hinder every man's unfettered judgment from taking a plain ground on which to erect itself as the proper keeper of God's word, determining by its own light what God's method of salvation is to be.

Then, whatever in the Scripture stands in the way of easy comprehension is removed by the ready contrivances

of figurative interpretations, limitations by the supposition of metaphor, as when the Unitarian, wishing to do away with the consubstantiality of the Son, explains the words, "I and my Father are one," as meaning only one in purpose.

And if there be any stubborn part, which will not yield to such a method of solution, it is cut out from the page of Scripture as being inconsistent, and the man soon comes to fix for himself what is and what is not Scripture; for the Church having been declared of no authority, which alone had decided what books were canonical, it is competent for any man to discard as unauthenticate any book, books, or parts of books hitherto resting only on her warrant, which may not suit his private judgment. Thus Luther discarded the Epistle of St. James, when it did not suit his hypothesis, was very near considering the Book of Jonas, as he says, "a great lie," and slighted the Book of the Proverbs and many others. Thus Strauss and the modern German school twist about the writings of the Evangelists according to their humour; and not without reason: for having no check but their own discretion, when they bereft Scripture of the Church's protection, it became quite defenceless against their attacks, and was exposed to be pulled in pieces as they list. Moreover, as every man becomes his own authority, if he happens to dislike any particular doctrine, it is not at all difficult for him, when he has got rid of the Church by a professed desire to respect Scripture, to put forward another truth in such a prominent way, by quotations of texts and other ways, as to make it seem inconsistent with the one he wishes to disparage, so that everything is made to give way to it.

Thus Dr. S. Clarke prefaces his attack upon the doctrine of the Trinity by an attempt to make Scripture his sole rule of faith; by which he manages to get rid of all the Church teaching which he does not like—such as the Athanasian Creed, whose downright language hardly any evasions could cheat of its meaning; and thus, the protector of the doctrine of the Trinity having been removed, there remains nothing to prevent him from abusing the Scripture to the purpose of defeating the fundamental part of our belief. It was by an appeal to Scripture without the Church, that Arians have covered all their attacks upon the same doctrine. It was by appealing to Scripture

stripped of its defence, the Church, that Socinus defended his declaring our Saviour a creature. It was under cover of their respect to Scripture, and Scripture alone, that the Presbyterians overthrew Episcopacy, rejected and inveighed against all set forms of prayer, denied the sacraments their dignity, abolished all decent order in communion, and instituted all the indecencies in the form of worship, which they now use.

Let not Protestants, whether thoroughly such or partially alive to the necessity of Catholic guidance, as Mr. Jackson the author of this sermon appears to be, suppose that these and the like things are so gross, as that there is no danger of such follies becoming general among mankind. Whether the men who fathered them were much below the bulk of mankind in natural ability or even piety, let *that* be judged by the number in those sects and churches, whom their force of genius and character have brought subject to their authority and regime so as to follow implicitly their dictates. And let the aversion of men to receive this kind of tenets, and their ability to defend their own souls against the poison of them by the armoury of true doctrine, be judged by the speed with which the spurious ones have gained credit, and the zeal with which these multitudes have maintained them.

It is by appealing to Scripture when unprotected by the Church, that the Scriptures have been the prey not only of every heretic but of every infidel. For when the Church's authority has been removed, and the Bible made an open field of debate, any man of a cavilling or irreligious temper, (as there are many,) when he has found in the Bible something that he cannot easily reconcile, or what shocks his understanding, is thus enabled to triumph against religion by the inconsistency which he fancies he has brought to light, and to shake the faith also of others who took the Bible as their impregnable fortress. They, on the other hand, who revere the Church's doctrine, well know that they are not to suppose every mystery of Scripture to be forthwith made plain, and are saved from what would else be these lamentable effects of their own simplicity.

Thus, while fidelity to wise doctrine and respect to Scripture is secured with him who keeps his reverence for the Church secure, he who once transfers the authority of interpreting Scripture from the *public* standard to his own

private judgment, has no longer any security whatever left, either for respect for the Bible, or for any part of the Faith. Scripture being looked upon as the sole authority, being once torn from the shelter of the Church, and being of no authority at all, every doctrine is looked upon as uncertain, and as a mere matter of opinion; one opinion is considered as good as another, and since there is no sect which may not get many followers, so every opinion being backed by numbers, is supposed to be reputable; right and wrong views are confounded, truth is desolated, the sacred writings are despised, all authority is mocked at, and the Faith is supplanted by a *blank* or rather a *blot*. And all this under pretext of taking as a rule of faith the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible.

Whether, then, this be the right view, is a thing which it certainly becomes well worth while for Anglicans to ponder, and for that reason we shall not hold it as a superfluous labour, even in the present generation, to make still *more* plain, for their sake, the main fact though often dwelt on, (the danger of forgetting which Mr. Jackson also has ventured to show,) viz., that so far from its being right to detach Scripture from the Church, Scripture must never be divorced from the teaching of the Church, but must always be read, and used, with a strict regard to some preceding standard of interpretation, since without this it would be unintelligible. For the New Testament throughout presupposes in the reader the knowledge and belief of the vital points of Christian doctrine, without which no man can duly appreciate any part of it.

This we might be thoroughly predisposed to think from what we know of the *intention* of the several authors of its contents: which, as we find, were written not for the mere *initiation*, but for the *edification* of the Christian Church, when in an advanced state, long after it had been invested with all powers requisite for it as a messenger of God's salvation; which it was first authorized to be on the memorable day of Pentecost; when there was granted to it (what had been promised) the final crowning qualification needed for the propagation of God's peace by witnessing for Him—the charge committed to it in our Lord's words to those who were afterwards to constitute it, "Go, therefore, teach ye all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I

have commanded *you*,"—and in these words also,—“ You shall be witnesses unto me in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and Samaria, and even unto the uttermost parts of the earth ;” and again, “ Whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven them : and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained.”

This trust of teaching, and remission of sins, (although they had received it,) they as yet waited to be capable of performing, until they had from the Lord what was to furnish their souls for the work, as we learn from His words : “ I send the promise of my Father upon you : but stay you in the city of Jerusalem till you be endued with power from on high,” “ which power,” said He, “ ye shall receive of the Holy Ghost coming upon you,” as had been pledged or potentially given by our Lord on the Sunday of His Resurrection forty days before, when breathing on them, He said, “ Receive ye the Holy Ghost,” in prospect of the gift of which, he commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but should *wait for the promise* of the Father, which, saith he, you have heard of my mouth. “ For John indeed baptized with water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.”

As yet then this promised solemn ratification of their authority had not arrived, and they therefore, obediently to their Lord's behest, waited at Jerusalem expecting its fulfilment : nor did they during the interval proceed to any ministerial work.

But, as we read in the 2nd Chapter : “ When the days of Pentecost were accomplished, they were all together in one place : and suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a mighty wind coming, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting. And there appeared to them parted tongues, as it were of fire, and it sat upon every one of them : And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they began to speak with divers tongues as the Holy Ghost gave them to speak.”

From this time then was *The Church* no less consummate than was the first created day, when, after the void mass was formed, God said, “ Let there be Light, and there was Light,” once, and for all, firmly started upon its earthly pilgrimage, with its first beginning the Lord's Apostles, who, together with their heirs for ever, were furnished with whatever was needful for carrying on their commission of evangelizing the world.

If they were before rude in knowledge, having the words of their Master lying crude in memory, these were now kindled into wisdom by the illuminating fire of the Holy Spirit, enabling them to speak forth life-giving oracles. If before this time they had been merely babes and stammerers, they were *now* armed with the gift of tongues, so that out of their mouth was ordained strength to tell out the wonderful acts of God.

If before they had been a company of sundry men, having each his own views and opinions, and only as yet *ordained* for high places in Christ, *now* the effusion of the Holy Spirit melted them into one body, so as to have all the same purpose and hopes. If before this time they were so weak, as that when without the visible presence of Jesus, they reeled fainting from the slightest breath of opposition from their fellow-mortals, *now*, when confirmed by the Holy Ghost, they were bound up into the strength of God, so as, (instead of keeping retired in an upper chamber,) to stand untterrified in assertion of their Faith, before the threats of sanhedrim and kings.

Thus were they indeed shown to have been really the anointed ones for the Church's groundwork; and if there was wanting any further proof of their divine authority, that was immediately sealed by their conversion on the same day of 3,000 souls. So that that Church,—that against which the gates of hell were not to prevail, that sanctuary where alone was to be learnt how rightly to call upon the only name under heaven whereby men may be saved, was, in such manner as to lack nothing as the accredited keeper and witness of Christ's Gospel, indelibly established from that day.

Long after this it was, that the Scriptures of the New Testament issued into the world, which were the gradual growth of accidental occasions happening to the Apostles, who, after this sanction from the Holy Ghost, going abroad into various parts, preached the Gospel, founded churches, baptized into the faith, appointed proper ordinances, settled discipline, ordained men to take their places upon their departure, in short, exercised all the functions necessary for the increase and welfare of the Church, and that so prosperously as to get the Church speedily established as a cognizable body in the world; and most firmly established too, since we find it flourishing at a high pitch in numbers, piety, and discipline.

We learn in the Acts of the Apostles how, when St. Peter preached to the mixed multitude of divers nations, they that gladly received the word, were baptized; and at one time of 3,000 converts, and at another we hear of a multitude of "about 5,000;" "a multitude of men and women;" "a great multitude of priests;" "of the extension of the Church to Samaria;" "of the conversion of the Gentiles."

It is needless to state what every one is familiar with,—the great progress of St. Paul's preaching: let it suffice to remind readers that before many years were expired, we find the Church established in Jerusalem, Judæa, Samaria, Syria; in Antioch, in Pisidia, in Thessalonica; at Athens, Corinth, Philippi, and other places of Macedonia; throughout Asia and Achaia; at Ephesus, Smyrna, and even Rome.

Such then was the progress of the Church in *numbers*, under the hands of a few men, SS. Peter, John and Paul, within less than thirty years after the great day of Pentecost; so that all this was only what can be traced to a *little* of the labours of a very *few* of the Apostles. What was the number of churches founded by St. Matthias, by St. Barnabas in Cyprus, by St. Philip, by St. James, whose places of labour we hardly hear of, by SS. Thomas and Bartholomew in India, by St. Matthew in Ethiopia, by St. Jude in Persia, by St. Simon in Egypt, by St. Andrew in Scythia, and by the rest in various parts of the globe, we hear little or nothing; so that the immense increase of the Church, of which we do hear, was the result of a few men's work. If then that small portion of this, which happens to have been recorded, be so large, should the whole seed spread by the aggregate labours of them all have been put down, what might we expect it to appear?

And as to the advancement in piety of this multitude, we learn from the accounts in the "Acts," and from the commendations of the Apostles, how they were "persevering" steadfastly "in the doctrine of the Apostles, in the communication of the breaking of bread, and in prayers," "praising God, and having favour with all the people;" how "the church had peace throughout all Judæa, and Galilee, and Samaria, and was edified, walking in the fear of the Lord, and was filled with the consolation of the Holy Ghost," and "confirmed in the faith." We learn

from the commendations given by St. Paul, how the "faith," of the Romans, "was spoken of in the whole world," Rom. i. 8; and perpetually throughout the Epistles, of the "knowledge," "the work of faith and labour of love," "patience," "works," and "charity" of the persons addressed by the writers; addressed as having at least received the faith, and as being confirmed Christians.

After all this we may ask, where there no churches for whose behalf the Scriptures were written, that were not already proficient in the doctrine of Jesus Christ at the very least, still needing to be taught and grounded in the elements of Christian faith?

And not only in piety, but in Ecclesiastical discipline was the Church well bestead, before it was furnished with any of our accounts of the Lord's acts and teaching, and with the Epistles, and the canon of Scripture. Without this it would be difficult to account for the division of labour, (if we may use the expression,) which seems already to have taken place, as we gather from St. Paul's most express language in the fourth of Ephesians, where he says, "how Christ having received gifts for ever, gave some apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and some pastors and doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ," which manifestly shows that a kind of order and stated distribution of evangelical labours into departments had already become a custom, if it were not from the very beginning of the Church. To the same effect also is that passage in the Romans: "So we being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another. And having different gifts, according to the grace that is given to us, either prophecy let us prophecy, to be used according to the rule of faith; or ministry in ministry, or he that teacheth in doctrine, or he that exhorteth in exhorting, he that giveth with simplicity, he that ruleth with carefulness;" in which is a recognition that certain gifts belong to certain offices. Still more distinctly and in series does he mention the several offices of the Church in 1 Cor. xii. 28. "And God hath indeed set some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly doctors; after that miracles, then the graces of healing, helps, governments, various kinds of tongues, interpretation of speeches. Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all doctors? are all workers of miracles?

have all the grace of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?" In the beginning of the same chapter, concerning the diverse operations of the Holy Ghost, there is a most express and eloquent treatment of the diversity compatible with unity existing in the Church with regard to the services of each member. We need not mention the various allusions to subordinate ministers made in parts of St. Paul's epistles, to bishops, and deacons, and elders.

Indeed there was, as we find from the history, and from the commendatory manner in which the apostles speak of their "order," a very regular discipline with ministers, higher and subordinate, at a time previous to the appearance of any Christian Scriptures, and much more, to anything like a common circulation of them. Therefore, before this time, when by looking at the matter in detail, we see how vastly numerous, how sound, how united was the Church, considering it was upon an earthly career; we may without error conclude, that whatever property was requisite for the Church to have for the keeping and propagating the true faith, *that* it was furnished with.

We know that at that time, as well as afterwards, thousands were baptized into the faith, lived and died in communion of God, were fed and nourished with the food of evangelic truth, and held the hope of everlasting life, after the light of the apostles' presence had been long withdrawn, or while there were only one or two, and the chief of them at Rome and in prison, or in the perils of travel, and yet the Scriptures relating to Christ had been only a few, and most not at all published, still less far and wide known. These grew up by little and little, according as they were called for by some occasion or other in the congregations which had been founded, and grown into prosperity by the labours of the apostles and their associates. For when the number of their flocks, which their zeal and mighty labours had effected to be very vast, outgrew in extent the means of their personal presence amongst them, they not only appointed subordinate ministers or deputies, to whom they committed as to faithful men, the trust of keeping up their doctrine, but it appears that they were minded sometimes to supply the lack of personal exhortation by writing to them, bidding them to keep in the faith wherein they had been baptized, and to walk worthy of their vocation; or by comforting them in their

trouble, if any were in such, or by deciding any controversies, or by correcting any mistakes that had arisen among them, one or other of which we find to be the object of every epistle that there is in our canon of Scripture.

Thus, an exhortation to walk and live as Christian men, mindful of their high and singular privileges, is the purpose of those five Epistles of St. Paul to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians; which are all letters, written out of an affectionate regard of their first founder to his beloved flocks, wherein having strongly and eloquently put them in remembrance of their blessed condition as baptized men, thanking God for the same, he ends by inculcating a holiness of life conformable to such a high station. Such is the theme of all these five Epistles.

To take one more example: Certain controversies and mistakes appear to have been the occasion that called forth the other more general Epistles—that to the Romans, the two to the Corinthians, that to the Galatians, and that to the Hebrews; the first of which he wrote for the sake of rectifying some very great errors that had been broached by two different parties at Rome, one Gentile and the other Jewish, concerning the priority of their several claims to the divine favour; and he therefore shows, that neither the law of Moses, on which the Jews prided themselves, nor the natural law of conscience possessed by the heathen would obtain pardon for them for their defects. Of somewhat a similar kind are his Epistles to the Corinthians, which he wrote for the sake of solving certain doubts in practice on which they had sent for his opinion; and he is therein led to speak of unity, the necessity of a more strict regard to moral conduct, of certain methods of public worship, the use of spiritual privileges, and he also answers some infidel objections to the resurrection of the dead, and other matters of a like kind.

The short notices prefixed to the other Epistles in almost every commentary upon Scripture will show that it was from certain emergencies or special occasions, not for the sake of first proclaiming and explaining the faith, but of comforting and strengthening, or of correcting errors of opinion, that all the twenty-one *Epistles* of Scripture were developed.

Besides these, in order to give them more ample food for the nourishing of their confidence in God, showing to

them more at large the power of that Lord, into whose fold they had been translated, the Fathers of the Church compiled histories of the acts and sufferings of Him in whom they hoped, such as were calculated to feed the flame of faith and charity by making them more particularly acquainted with all the matters connected with the blessed event of His visitation of the earth. This we find was the design of St. Luke's Gospel, as is hinted in the preface to it, which the author, addressing his Christian friend Theophilus, to whom he wrote it, says, he had "set forth in order a narrative of," that he might know at large the verity of those things in which he had been catechised. Thus the person Theophilus was already a believer, and he was to study this book of St. Luke that he might become more learned in the truths which he had already been taught. The peculiar character of St. John's Gospel, which is so well known to have had an end so far removed from any merely initiatory purpose into the articles of faith, need only be mentioned to convince any person, the least acquainted with Biblical history that it was for the sake of promoting, not of beginning, in believers the knowledge of the more valuable facts of their holy religion for which these came into being, the books of the Gospels.

And in order to let those who were desirous to know more particularly of the progress of that Church which had been such a blessing to them, nothing could be more interesting or likely to be read with pleasure, than the biography and adventures of the *founders* of the Churches—the Saints who had ordained it, their enterprises, dangers, and sayings; and, accordingly, we find the book of the "Acts of the Apostles." What was the proximate occasion of this, but St. Luke's desire to give an account of the most notable actions of those Apostles with whom he was best acquainted, and for the truth of whose history he could vouch?

Thus, then, it was particular emergencies—such as desire for enlightenment, controversies to be settled, or the difficulties and questions of some of the faithful, or, more generally, the dear care of their pastor—brought forth the *Epistles*, the Histories of our Lord, and of His Apostles, indeed, the whole of what is called the New Testament.

These therefore, we must repeat, came, not to ground

but to edify, not to persuade men into Christianity (for Christians they all were who had to read it) but to encourage them in the faith; not that they should be born in knowledge, but having been born into and bred in the Church's doctrine, they should be fed and cherished in it, and led up further into its mysteries; not as if the readers had any doubt of the truths, but would have opportunity for progress in them. It was, therefore, subsequent to the establishment of the Christian Church as a principality that there was any production of the canonical Scriptures, much more any extensive circulation of them in an aggregate form, for it was not until the immediate interest which the event had excited among the fresh converts had subsided, that the Scriptures were gathered up into one volume, as we have them at the present time; during which period we may suppose each of the books to have lain by itself amongst the persons to whom it might happen to have been dedicated. Thus there might be one at Corinth, another at Rome, another at Ephesus, and all strewn about the world, until the lapse of generations had rendered them precious antiquities, after which the few remnants of the apostles' writings would at length be collected by the reverent diligence of their posterity, and what could be found, however slight, would be presented to the Church in the form in which it remains until this day—the savings out of a golden treasure of apostolic writings, which, from the very force of the interest excited and missionary labours, we must know, if we had it all, would be immense. If, then, the treatises, histories, and epistles upon the matter of the Church's religion, which the indifference of their authors to their being digested and deposited in a public form, proves them not to have intended them as a statute of reference for simple novices, were produced in a state of the Church so advanced as we find it to have been from the Scriptures themselves, so secure as to its continuance, so healthful in its practice, so orderly in its discipline, so stable, so undoubting in the faith: would not any person looking out for the truth of the matter, and willing to give due regard to moral evidence, be inclined rather than not to expect—nay, would he not be very much surprised to find it otherwise than—that they should be composed in a manner such as was not altogether adapted for heathens or infidels? Would it be a very great stretch of conjecture to think it likely that the writers would address them as

not altogether rude and ignorant in the faith of that Gospel in whose truths they are described as having been so well instructed, in whose law they had been so well trained, and in whose light they had been so long walking?

Would it not be expected that the writings of those men would be found *taking for granted* that they did not now need to be retaught those rudiments of religion which they must long ago have outgrown, even to have received the sign by baptism of their initiation into it?

Should we not rather look in these books for *edification*, and advance in religious knowledge, rather than as mere elementary handbooks for those about to be admitted into the privileges of believers?

Should we, then, be surprised if we did not find any formal statement of the mere grounds and alphabet of the faith, which, unless a man have, he is so far from coming within the class of "*Saints*" as the readers are addressed as being, that he cannot be considered as a member even of the visible Church so as to understand the very *names* of the subjects therein treated?

Should we not then expect to find the principles of the Christian faith, which the readers were supposed to be already fully aware of, and no longer requiring to be instructed in, *taken for granted*, and left to the care of those persons who had been *expressly ordained* for the purpose of teaching and keeping it inviolate? If so, we must assuredly not look for the treatment of the simple articles or elements of the Christian religion, although they may here and there be mentioned incidentally, or involved by implication. We must seek for the enforcement of holiness on evangelic principles, rather than for those principles stated formally for their own sake, as if they had ever been unknown or questioned.

And that it does so we shall endeavour to demonstrate, by showing that, so far from Scripture being such an elementary rule for the articles of the Christian Faith, it does take the whole elements of the Christian Faith *for granted*, and proceeds thereupon as being indubitable.

And here it might be sufficient, perhaps, for guarding against the contrary assertion (instead of examining Scripture expressly for the purpose) to ask of any person affirming it, "Where is there a single book of the whole of the New Testament, from the beginning to the end, whether we look at those four histories of our Lord's

ministry, entitled the Gospels, or that narrative of the promulgation of the Gospel by two or three of the Apostles, called the "Acts," or at St. Paul's thirteen Epistles, congratulatory, corrective, or familiar, or at those of SS. Peter, Jude, James, and John, or at that wit-baffling writing of St. John called the Apocalypse,—in which of these remains of Apostolic antiquity, comprising what now we call the "New Testament" (which, by the bye, are writings rather *about* the New Testament), can we find evidence of the slightest kind, that any of the several authors of them had the most distant notion of giving in them a sole rule of faith to their contemporaries, much more to their posterity, or of completing by any additions any written rule of faith by laying down in them, once and for all, for the first and last time any fundamental propositions? Where is the book which does not speak to the readers as already baptized into the faith, and having acquaintance with its fundamental articles, into which they had been received? Where is the Epistle which begins these things anew, and announces them, as for the first time, and finally, as if the Christian doctrine could be confined to the limits of a sheet of paper or a skin of parchment?

This might suffice to meet and silence the designs of such as, desiring to render themselves independent of the Catholic doctrine of tradition, talk loudly about Scripture doctrines instead, and pretend to fetch their opinions on fundamental points from the "Word of God," (meaning by that only these few historic sketches.) But inasmuch as, besides the refutation of these notions, a more clear view into the matter will be attended with some benefit by the light it will throw upon the true use and dignity of the Scriptures, we will enquire into the relation in which Christian doctrine and Scriptural teaching stand to each other by comparing them together. And for this purpose we may confine ourselves to the Gospels, and not speak so particularly of either the Acts of the Apostles, or of the Epistles, or Apocalypse, because *they* are not so likely, if any are, to be imagined as depositories of fundamental points, as those which come first in order after the title-page, the Gospels themselves, which give the very life and discourses of our Lord Himself; and whatever arguments will be used concerning them will easily suggest to the reader sufficient for the treatment of the Epistles and

Apocalypse. These Gospels, therefore, we shall at present confine ourselves to, from which we shall see that they do presuppose in the reader an acquaintance with the main things necessary to be most surely believed amongst Christians.

It may be clearly seen from *this*, that the fundamental principles it is the aim of the four Gospels not to teach from the beginning, but to *illustrate*.

When we say "*illustrate*," we must not be understood as meaning that they bring forward *proofs*, as if the matter illustrated had not been before received with implicit belief, or as if it had been at all brought into debate; there is nothing in them of a nature that could arise out of controversy, or adapted to the use of a controversial or doubting spirit; no prejudices of a faithless mind are designed to be cleared away by them, nor are any such answered or even by anticipation guarded against. The events therein recorded are not robbed of their marvellousness nor apparent improbability to suit the incredulous nature of proud man. No cavils are answered; and even when St. Matthew, at the end of his Gospel, tells us that some of the Jews invented a story about his disciples stealing away the body of Jesus, to make it appear His Resurrection was not a fact, he does not deign to answer it. No cavils of any such description are guarded against, except as simple narrative is armed against cavils. The miracles are not softened so as to appear less improbable, nor are the hard words of our Lord made easy to suit the desires of such as like not to take up the cross daily. No questions beginning with, "Why should these things be?" or "How should these things be?" are answered; and if they had, it would have made the books as infinite as are the fetches of a cavilling mind, or as the pertinacity of conceited ignorance. In them, as we know, there is no attempt to bring down religious manifestations to a level with the natural understanding, "which discerneth not spiritual things," nor with "the carnal mind" which relishes not "spiritual things."

Not of a nature then to reconcile pride or prejudice are the testimonies in the gospels, which are testimonies to the mission and godhead of Jesus Christ, (not for the sake of clearing up doubts, or dispelling unbelief,) but such as cannot be received by any but those whom God has gifted with faith to believe, first without proof the power and

goodness of God, to do beyond all that we could expect or account for. This is the kind of spirit expected for the fruition of the four gospels, which instead of stopping here and there, and going out of their way to explain themselves, or leaving out anything that might offend prejudice, for the sake of guarding against objections, begin their story without preface, and end without formal conclusion, going straightforward like Ezekiel's four living creatures, whither the spirit was to go, go they, they turn not as they go. Whom God does not reconcile to them, they seek not by any deference to reconcile to themselves. "He that hath ears to hear," alone can hear what their spirit says, those whom God through their faith has prepared to receive their light, them they enlighten only.

When therefore we say they "*illustrate*," we do not mean that the four gospels were intended merely for such a purpose as the author of "the Evidences of Christianity" has used them, to clear away the difficulties which a doubtful mind might have, nor to reconcile the unsearchable mysteries of Christ to a profane and curious inquirer, but that they were written with a single intent to *illustrate* for the sake of instructing those who were full of a godly desire to seek diligently as for hid treasures, for the treasures of spiritual wisdom, as St. Luke says, "to set forth in order a narration of those things that had been accomplished, that they might know the infallible certainty of those things in which they had been orally instructed."

Such are the persons to whom the gospels address their illustrations of Christian doctrine, by which we do not mean that they portray at full length, and from the mere elements as a mathematical book would its science, its doctrines; on the contrary, they are seldom referred to, never mentioned as for their own sake in the gospels; these are the historical evidences for the truth, but Christianity is the truth itself.

To see the difference better, let us call to mind some of the classes of doctrines which a Christian, as a Christian, has to consider for his spiritual welfare.

Amongst these, there are many things belonging to his own state as a child of fallen man, such as his own sinfulness and inability to help himself, and the apprehended future awaiting him. These, though from their subjective nature not so strictly theology, are so necessarily connected with it, as to be treated often in the same books with

it, and must be feelingly known in order to find the value of these objects of faith, which must be believed in order to cure the evils found by an insight into his own self. These being objective, are more eminently belonging to theology, or the doctrine of divine truth. Such are those enumerated in the first part of the Nicene Creed, teaching the belief "in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, and born of the Father before all ages; God of God, light of light, true God of true God, begotten not made, consubstantial to the Father, by whom all things were made. Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven." Then there are matters belonging to the eternal Word becoming flesh and dwelling among us, which are related in the next part as far as to the ascension into heaven; viz. "and became incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, *and was made man*. He was crucified also for us, suffered for us under Pontius Pilate, and was buried. And the third day he rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, sitteth on the right hand of the Father." All these are facts which took place in accomplishment of God's will upon the earth.

Then there are matters relating to the destiny of man, arising from Christ's assumption of the manhood and the gifts of the Holy Ghost, which may enable him to ensure a happy fruition of his immortality; such are in the last words: "And he is to come again with glory, to judge both the living and the dead, of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, who together with the Father and the Son is adored and glorified, who spake by the prophets. And one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, one baptism for the remission of sins," and "the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come."

Of these four classes of doctrine then intimately relating to, and correspondent to each other, as sorrow past to future joy, of past labour and agony to future glory, the first are lamentable facts evident upon our own experience, which if a man be ignorant of, he can have no relish whatever for religion which is their balm—these, therefore, are presupposed in him who reads the divine writings of

the Gospels, which we can hardly call dissertations upon the depravity of man.

The second, with which the Nicene creed commences, are glorious mysteries, which of all others may be called spiritual truth, or the matter of theology and the objects of faith. They are true from their own abiding nature, as existing whether there were a manhood or not, whether there was any to be saved or not. Of which of these can we say that they took place to our knowledge on such and such a day, or at such and such a place? which we *can* say, however, of the part of the Nicene Creed beginning with the Incarnation, as far as the Ascension—of the things related by SS. Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, whose books are histories of facts, (not truths,) which had their course until our Lord took the manhood into heaven—what happened to Him, as His birth, death, and sufferings, and what was done by Him, as His works, and His sayings.

Here then is the difference between the two, the essential and abstract truths of theology, which have a place higher and *previous* to the Incarnation, and those facts which happen in order *after* the Incarnation, the junction of which one to the other through the mercy of God, it is which is Christianity. The first are ever present and eternal truths, which may be said to be as true at one time as another; the other are historical facts, which take place at a certain season: the first belong to eternity, and are infinite; the other take place in time and space: the first are the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever; the other, when once done are done for ever.

Again, that which comes last in the same Creed, the destiny of man, the resurrection and judgment to come, his present access to means of grace, are matters belonging to the future for the most part, or to the current state of the world, and for that reason are not the proximate subjects of the Gospels, which are histories of past events.

In as far then as man's present state, and future hopes, and eternal truths, can be illustrated by historical facts of thirty-three years, so far are the doctrines of Christianity illustrated by the records of the earthly events in the Gospels. But is it by a philosophical explanation of them, so as to justify them before men? That would have been to bring them down to be viewed by profane eyes, who could not profit by them; and if explained, it would no longer be

said that faith was needful. Besides, it is not to every one that they are revealed. "To you," said our Lord to His faithful disciples, "it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God, but to the rest," (that is the careless multitude,) "in parables, that seeing they may not see, and hearing may not understand."

It is not then by explaining them, or showing them naked to man's intelligence, that the heavenly mysteries are illustrated by these histories.

Nor is it by drawing out the statement of these truths as in a tabular form, at full length, and giving them their proper names, and then adding such and such are the requisite matters for a Christian man's belief. They would then be charts or maps of divinity, and not history, as they are. It is not then by a *portraiture* of theological belief, that it is illustrated by the life of our Lord, as narrated in the four Gospels.

How then do these historic narratives illustrate these theological truths?

Simply by rendering incontestible, through infallible signs and wonders, what ensured to mortals a participation of that glorious destiny which Christianity warrants to us—namely, the mighty event, (not the high truth, *that Christ was God*, but,) that *Jesus was the Christ*; not that there was a future state of bliss and misery, (this had been believed before by Jew and heathen,) but that He that was to vanquish hell and open the kingdom of heaven to all believers was come; not that there was God, (this was also a general belief with the better taught, and universal with the Jews,) but that God had been "made manifest in the flesh;" not that there was a Mediator, but that the Mediator was *here*; not, in fine, that Christ should atone for our sins by His sufferings, but that Jesus had suffered. In short, His *appearance*, not His prior *existence*; His sufferings, not His mediation by those sufferings; in *what fashion* He appeared, not *who He was*; what He had *done*, not *why* He had done it; what He had *said*, not *what He would teach* us by His sayings:—these are the offices of the Gospels, and beyond this office they must not be expected, at least directly, to step.

In fact, whatever relates to the actual coming of the Lord in the flesh as Mediator, as Ransomer, as the Incarnate God, in His visible, lowly, and ignoble habit, these we may not be surprised to find; and it is by this

that the higher and more *interior* doctrines of Christianity are illustrated, and by giving the exterior and visible manifestation of Christ in the Gospels. Their true business therefore is entirely the recording the testimonies of the divinity of Jesus, Son of Mary, or of God the Son's taking upon Himself manhood; for both of these, (which are exchanged views of the same thing, one from a *heavenly*, and the other from an *earthly* point of view,) seem to ensure to us a participation in a divine nature. For to prove that Jesus of Nazareth was, as St. Peter confessed, "the Christ of God," proves the union of God and man, and to show that Christ was come in the fashion of a servant, the reputed son of Joseph, proved that we men had now an interest in God.

Now this illustrates Christianity, by giving to man's feeble intelligence, as much as his faith may without injury to God's name ask—namely, proofs of the genuineness of Christ's mission, not indeed by rehearsing expressly the history of His descent upon earth, (they leave the preacher and personal teacher to do that,) but by giving concurring testimonies to the fact, in the same way as the Phenomena of Nature illustrate by giving evidence of (not enunciating or preaching forth with naked words) the wisdom of God, and his mercy to man. This we find silently witnessed with a testimony only appreciable by such as, (like Moses who turned aside to see why the bush was not burnt,) would search out the meaning of things. So also in the Gospels, and we might add also in the History of the Old Testament, the Almighty manifests Himself as moving in a mysterious way. His goodness and His majesty are shown by effects, and in its lowest effects, His works do not interpret themselves any more than nature does; which do not say, "I am good," "These are my purposes and my meaning." It is the philosopher who must do this, and he learns his little knowledge by a most heedful search into it.

And in like manner they who would know more of God's wonderful dealings in *redemption*, see (as on the face of nature, the marks of wisdom and the beginning of their reasoning,) in the Gospels what may—if they dig, if they explore, and "search," as our Saviour told the Jews to do—what may make them wise in the purposes of grace, whose outer and coarsest garments their surface words are. There they lie as facts to be *considered*, and they so far

illustrate the view to man, as he brings to them a mind studious to understand parables and dark sayings, from a right preparation by the Church.

But it is the Church in whom alone the enlightening Spirit dwells, that must lead our mind within the veil of mere human language. Thus, for instance: If the Church proclaims first to us that the Son of God for our sake, "came down from heaven, and was incarnate, and was made man," this doctrine the Gospels nowhere *ostensibly* teach so broadly as if they had intended us to have that impression, but we find in them this historical fact, that He of whom it is said, that being God he became man, was born of a pure Virgin, and many other things relating to His birth, which are not said of any other, thus giving the corresponding earthly fact which such a doctrine might teach us to value.

If it is believed as the doctrine of the Church, that He by His merits takes upon Himself off us the burden of a perfect service of God, by His fulfilling all righteousness, we have it not indeed stated, that He *did* release us from the punishment of breaking the law; but we have historical testimonies, that He of whom it is said that He fulfilled all our righteousness, did undergo the rites of circumcision and baptism, the pain of fasting, the trial of temptation, the labour of serving God, and the penalty of death.

If it be believed, as the Church bids us believe, that He made an atonement for our sins by the sacrifice of Himself, this is nowhere stated in the words of the Gospels by any of their authors; but with regard to the great Person of whom it is said, they inform us that He did die upon the cross, being put to death by Pontius Pilate.

If the Church preaches that in the name of Jesus there is forgiveness of sins for those who believe in His name, or secondly, that the amount of man's sins will not exclude him from salvation if they are truly repented of, and replaced by faith and charity; these things the Gospels nowhere enunciate, but we find facts very conformable to these doctrines, 1st. That He whom the Church proclaims as justifying from their sins, gave a sure sign, to let us know that the Son of Man had power on earth to forgive the sins of one sick of the palsy, by enabling him to take up his bed and walk; and also that the same Person declared before a sinful woman that she had been "for-

given" much because she had "loved much," and therefore bidding her "go in peace," for her "faith had saved her."

If the Church teaches that by Jesus Christ, we may expect the resurrection of the body after death, which the Gospels do not inculcate, and only mention incidentally, this has a corresponding *fact* in the history of Jesus, that He, on the third day after death, rose again.

If the Church, the witness for Christianity, teaches us that those who trust in Him, shall be glorified together with Him and the Father, the Gospels are not explicit upon this; but they tell us, that after being seen forty days after His resurrection, He was taken up into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God.

If the Church doctrine bids us look upon him as divine, this the Gospels nowhere affirm, or are explicit so as to exclude a controversy; but they give us for the sake of those who already believe it, or wish to believe it, testimonies from the dæmons, testimonies from voices heard from heaven, testimonies of signs, testimonies of power, by healing, and raising the dead, testimonies from a man speaking in the Spirit of God, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;" testimonies by holiness, in abstinence and beneficence; testimonies of wisdom, in parables and teaching; and withal, testimonies of glory, by miracles; testimonies of prophecy fulfilled, to show that the Person *so pointed at* as divine, was declared to be so however by heaven and hell, by men too and angels.

Thus then, not by enunciating the truth, and so soliciting belief, but by allowing speechless testimonies, as in some spectacle, to pass before the disciple of Christ's religion, for the sake of such as should enunciate, or believe it, do our Evangelists justify, and illustrate it when proclaimed by the Church.

If then Christian truth be thus assisted by the works of the four Evangelists, it remains now to enquire how far they are dependent for their efficacy upon the Church, as furnished on the day of Pentecost with the gifts of tongues and the interpretation of tongues. It is her office to teach as is taught by that Spirit, (who brings all things to her remembrance whatsoever her Lord spoke,) to enforce upon men Christ's words, and, amongst other things to bring into her service the books written concerning our Lord by her Saints and Apostles. The letter of

their remains derives its use from their subserviency to the Church as a depositary of the doctrines and ordinances of Christ, without which they would be entirely unintelligible and unserviceable.

When, for instance, opening the first page of St. Matthew, an uninformed man reads that Abraham begat Isaac, and Isaac begat Jacob, that Jesse begat David the king, and so forth, down to Jacob who begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ, what would this convey any more than any other genealogy, if he had not heard of Christ or of what he was to expect from Him? Plainly, nothing at all more than if it were the list of any other names; for the Evangelist does not tell him wherefore he writes all this genealogy, nor does he inform him where he is to go to learn its use. But suppose that this man, instead of being uninformed, should be a Hebrew convert, in the early age of the Christian Church, which had put into his hands the Gospel of St. Matthew for his instruction, (and we must mind that St. Matthew's Gospel was written expressly for Hebrew converts, and not for Gentiles,) then the whole list becomes full of light, because it gives him to understand, what the prophecies of his nation had taught him to expect, that He whom he learnt was the Messiah, was really of the seed of Abraham, and through the loins of Jesse and David; and it is for this cause that the genealogy is given, and in a manner different from St. Matthew's account, which traces it up to Adam; but St. Luke nowhere tells us that this was the reason of his stating, and thus stating, the descent. In this instance, the first which the volume opens to us, does the Church doctrine that Christ was the Messiah not only receive light *from*, but gives light and meaning *to*, this unspeaking testimony of our Lord's authentic descent from the patriarchs.

Again, supposing the same person reading on should find it stated that the same one, whose descent he had just read, was born after a manner quite beyond the ordinary course of experience, and also that he was named Jesus, what would he understand by it, what would he be inclined to think, if uninstructed, who the Holy Ghost was? The whole event would be to him, if not already a believer, as uninteresting, and perhaps more unintelligible, than any other history of a birth; but if he should have been taught by his Church, as a Hebrew convert, that this

"Christ" was the promised Messiah who should restore all things, and that the Holy Ghost was God, he would not be long in appreciating the words with which the narrative ends, "Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which the Lord spoke by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel."

■ So also, if he should read in the next chapter, and find in it accounts of four separate things—viz., the *place* of the same person's birth, His going down into Egypt, the slaughter of the Innocents by Herod, His going back to Nazareth—what service could such facts, any more than the birth-place, and change of residence, and return of any other person, be, however true, to any reader, if not already a Christian? But suppose him, again, a Hebrew convert, who had been taught to place all his hopes in Jesus, these facts then, instead of being mere isolated notices, without reference to the Christian student, would become most dear and valuable testimonies to the verity of Christ's claim to the Messiahship, inasmuch as they show the accordance of the events with the four several predictions, justifying the words of the Evangelist as follows: "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet: And thou, Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda, for out of thee shall come the captain that shall rule my people Israel." Secondly, "Out of Egypt have I called my Son." Thirdly, "A voice was heard in Rama, lamentation and great mourning; Rachel, bewailing her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not;" and, fourthly, "He shall be called a Nazarite."

These prophecies, then, being fulfilled by these events, the recording of them by St. Matthew, who does not explain why he gives this accordance of the prophecy and event, is valuable to a person previously instructed by his Church how to use them as testimonies to his belief; but to whom else?

Again, the doctrine of the Atonement also sheds a light upon the Gospels, and makes them valuable; this doctrine is nowhere stated in them, nor do they tell us that we must look to Jesus for the expiation of our sins.

Now, then, suppose any one quite unconvinced of his perilous state, and untaught by the Church concerning the necessity of a Redeemer, or of his insufficiency to

merit salvation himself, should read (not the birth, but) the circumstances connected with the death of Jesus, who was born at Nazareth, and that he was crucified, what would all this show to him, or of what possible service could it be to him, as an imperfect creature, more than the account of the crucifixion of any one of the many hundreds and thousands who had been crucified in the same manner?

But suppose he had been made to feel his utter hopelessness to visit the face of God without the mediation of Jesus Christ, who, by taking upon Himself the punishment due to us, had freed us from liability,—then the sufferings and death, as exhibited in the Evangelists, become testimonies to the required fact, that the person thus declared as the Mediator *did* suffer and die, although he would have to learn from the Church that He suffered and died for him.

Again, suppose he should read in the Gospels the account of the same Person's appearance alive after three days, what would it be to him, if unlearned in the promise of immortality? They nowhere tell him, what use would it be to him. Or of His Ascension forty days after into heaven—what could he make of these? Or, in short, of other such facts? He would, of course, peruse this the same as any other story which he could neither account for nor appreciate.

But would he do so if he had been taught, and, what is more, had well learned to believe as our creed tells us to believe, in the resurrection of his own body, and also as he is taught to hope by the traditional preaching of the Church, in his following of Christ to heaven by the power of Jesus, now Lord, then the narrative of Jesus' rising from the dead, and of his ascension into heaven, would be inestimable truths, to be used as earnest of his own resurrection and his ascent to glory.

These few examples will perhaps suffice to suggest what may serve to show how entirely dependant upon the light of the Church is that portion of Christian literature called the Gospels, in regard to *doctrine*; we shall now use a few words with regard to *ordinance*.

We may suppose a man who had never been told of any church, or of the necessity of being initiated into it, reads in three out of the four Evangelists a few lines in each concerning Jesus having, at the time of supper, taken the

chalice and said, "Take and divide it among you;" and, afterwards, the same with the bread; and then added certain words to the effect that what He broke was His body, and the chalice a New Testament, according to the narrative in the Gospels, which is as short as this, what could he possibly understand by such language? would he not give it up as not belonging to him? would he (can we suppose it likely), on reading such words, consider himself bound to prepare bread and wine, to bless and use after the same Eucharistic manner? Would he see in these few short passages an account more suggestive of personal obligation to him than in the account of any other supper, or eating, or drinking? Would he say, Here is an evident authority for the use of a Sacrament for all generations; and, since there is no word in the Gospels explaining or commenting upon this fact, he would of course dismiss it from his memory as not more significant than any other historical fact? The same may be observed with regard to baptism, on which there is still less in the history of its institution, if indeed those in the Gospel *be* the history of the *institution* of it, (which, for anything we should know from the *Gospels themselves*, might have been instituted and taught to the Apostles themselves during the forty days, or even during the first part of our Lord's ministry, when He was baptized Himself.) In them there is, as everybody knows, nothing except an instruction of the most general character. Would he see in it, so obscure and short a hint, any reason for him to take to himself a duty of baptizing, or of being baptized, much less to have infants baptized, of whom it says nothing, and would at first seem, from the requirement of belief, to exclude from it? But if he had been bred up in a reverence for the holy Sacraments of Baptism and of the Eucharist as a Christian, and had been taught by the Church, as the keeper and dispenser of these ordinances, the good of them in order to salvation, he would not be long in discerning that these little facts, brief and reservedly mentioned as they are, are not insignificant, but contain testimonies to Christ's institution, descriptive of these Sacraments, which he might use as a warrant for believing more and more his Church. Thus short narratives, else to him sealed parables, become bright with the light which the traditional law of the Church throws upon them, as well as they upon the usage of the Church.

These few instances, which might indeed be multiplied, will serve to show how necessary it is that there should be a depositary and a declarer of Gospel truths and ordinances, to make the four Gospels testimonies of any utility, and indeed at all comprehensible.

But when they are both had, they reflect and receive light one from another, and we see that while these Gospels would be dark and sealed books without the Church to use them, that the Church also would lack a most inestimable treasure as a text from which to preach Christ crucified. We may see that, since the Evangelists nowhere tell their readers how they are to apply to their salvation, or to their duty as Christians, or to their faith, the historical facts which are there arranged in order, since they do not tell us even that they *are* testimonies, still less explain to us what *truths* they testify, (presupposing a knowledge of all these things,) we are driven upon the conclusion that there must be somewhere or other another source to show that they are testimonies, and also what they point at and attest. It is needful that there should be some minister and propounder of the truths thus warranted by them; that if the mediation of Christ be necessary for our union with God, there must be some person to lead us to Him and tell us of our wants. Since, indeed, these Gospels nowhere tell us anything about *ourselves*, but only about *Jesus* of Nazareth and of His life, where are we bound to look but either in some other books or in some living witness?

And if books do not tell us, except those written or authorized by the Church itself, what ordinances are necessary to our spiritual health, what can we use as a means to convince others of their necessity, or to assure ourselves? This office the living witness of the Church ever has and has had, whose power and commission, first delivered on the day of Pentecost, suffers even until the world's end no alteration in its carriage, any more than does a fire while it lasts, whose essence is as pure when centuries have elapsed as when it was first kindled. How then can any doctrine of the Church corrupt or change, that is itself freighted with a fire; (which is much the truer emblem than what, from the seeming possibility, however unlikely, of its being tainted, many have chosen for their similitude,—a stream of water.)

For in what form did the Holy Spirit, both the Church's

conductor and burden too, descend, when he visited as an abiding guest the assembly prepared for its elements, but in that of fire, never changing, never tiring fire? By which he teaches us that he will not allow ever to fail, ever to betray its commission, or to give a dubious light the Apostolic Church, His chosen living temple. It is there He waits to be gracious to men, that we may obtain the gifts of assurance and wisdom. And as at the first it was she, (not printed books,) who being gifted with this unfaltering light, was by her ministers and officers, to go into all lands preaching the gospel to every creature, and teaching men to observe whatever the Lord had taught her; so *now* it is she, ruled by Him who engraves upon the heart what is written upon paper, whose law and custom alone renders intelligible, a document at any time written by those officers in a human language, whether it be gospel, epistle, or revelation; for without her, there could be no meaning for them, because there would then be no garden sacred to Christ's death and resurrection, where the divine interpreter might perpetually dwell.

And when He shall have ascended from the earth, where He now deigns to abide until His triumph-time on earth with His Church, her guide and comforter, then it will most certainly be seen that prophecies, and knowledge, as well as scriptures also, have availed as little for man's hope, as that darkness in which all earthly substances will then be left, unless they have been used gratefully as *subordinate* means of grace, to second and strengthen the work of that one Church whose property they are, by whose spirit they were dictated, and by whose ministers composed.

ART. X.—1. *Sketches of the History of Christian Art.* By LORD LINDSAY. 3. vols. Murray, 1847.

2.—*The Exhibition of the Royal Academy, 1847.* (*Catalogue.*)

THE pages of our Review have been more than once devoted to the subject of Christian art. Both directly and indirectly, we have sought to excite an interest in it, and to inculcate its principles. And we have many reasons for believing that we have not laboured in vain. We do

not pretend to have produced a painting by anything that we may have written, nor even perhaps to have laid down a single new principle. But debarred as Englishmen have been from acquaintance with an art essentially religious, and from the power of contemplating its results—unconscious as English Catholics necessarily were of the artistic power of principles and doctrines, rites and practices of their Church, from not having witnessed their fruits, the first step towards creating a school of English religious art, naturally was to bring before the mind such general information on the subject as would excite curiosity, and such more definite views as would give rise to hopes at least and to endeavours.

Besides, therefore, articles devoted expressly to this matter, we have never failed to embrace any opportunity that presented itself, of pointing out the beauties and artistic elements of the Catholic ceremonial, as well as the poetry of our ritual and forms of prayer, all eminently conducive to the creation of religious art. Many considerations have now brought us to the conclusion that the time is at length come, for practice rather than theory, and that we must earnestly think of embodying in actual representation those forms of beauty, which we have till now contemplated as either reflections of past realities, or as shadows of possible futurities. If it has been given to this Review to lead forward the Catholic mind to higher and better views, upon the more *æsthetic* parts of ecclesiastical and religious institutions; if its mission has been in the past to open brighter prospects which have not been disappointed; if it has successfully seconded and promoted the ecclesiological movement, such as it has been amongst us, and the theological movement which has been without, we feel that it is only fulfilling a portion of its duty as an exponent of Catholic feeling and Catholic truth, by turning the minds of our fellow-catholics to a more practical realization of what till now have been but hopes, of the foundation of a religious school of design and art in England.

We have uniformly observed, that in our age as in every other, indefinite instincts precede clear indications of great beneficial changes; there is a silent yearning, a consciousness of want, before active measures are even thought of, a discontent of the past and actual state of things before plans are gone into for the future. We could illustrate this course of things in various ways, having reference to

the religious occurrences of the last few years. But in regard to religious art, we think the manifestations of desire for better things are very clear, and sufficiently strong to make us think of how they may be attained.

First, there has been more knowledge obtained and diffused among the people in general, and among Catholics in particular, on the existence, and perhaps the characteristics, of Christian art. Many have become acquainted with them by travelling, and more works have been lately written on the subject. The one before us is a remarkable one, not as a popular, but as a very learned and diligent, and often even eloquent book, though far from Catholic. But we will reserve our remarks on it to a later portion of our article. At present we will content ourselves with remarking, that the names of Christian artists dead and living, have become much more familiar to us than they used to be. Catholics, even the less learned in such things, would know, if they were told of a painting of the Blessed Angelico or Overbeck, that there would be necessarily a religious tone and character in it, such as they would never expect to find in one of West or Sir Joshua Reynolds.

But secondly, our taste has as much to do in the matter as our knowledge. We have learnt what is a religious tone and character. A few years ago, specimens of art worthy of the name, were not within our reach. A few costly engravings of older masters might indeed be found in the portfolios of rich *connoisseurs*, from which the character of Christian artists might be studied, but nothing could be more paltry, more degrading to their subjects, than the majority of prints furnished by France, or by our own country, to the bulk of our people. Wretched in design as in execution, devoid of all feeling, of all expression, of all mere beauty even, they were calculated only to give the idea that religious representations stood below, rather than above, every other department of art. Tawdrily coloured prints, ill-defined mezzotintos, or rude etchings of meanly imagined figures, formed the staple of decorations for the room, or of illustrations for the prayer-book. Neither devotion nor even a pious thought could be inspired by such abortions of art. By degrees, however, engravings of a superior style have found their way from France and Germany. The Academy of Düsseldorf has become the regenerator of religious taste all over Europe. The beautiful designs of Overbeck, Deger, the two Müllers, and

other artists, have been exquisitely engraved by Keller and his school, and through the modern machinery of an association, have been scattered on every side at the lowest price; a price which would bring them within the reach of the poorest peasant in this country but for the barbarous duty, which is fully equal to the cost of the print.* The importation of these admirable specimens of religious art, has led to a successful imitation, or rather copying both of their subjects and style in England. Mr. Dolman reproduced Curmer's designs from Overbeck, (which though published in Paris, were executed at Düsseldorf,) with great success; and most of the Düsseldorf Society's series has been re-engraved at Derby, and published by Messrs. Richardson, with their usual spirit.

The effect of these publications has been very important; they have, as we have observed, brought home to the eyes and feelings of Catholics of every rank, specimens of real Christian art. Few, perhaps, can judge of the accuracy of the design or the delicacy of the engraving; but every one can *feel* the accordance between the expression and ideas and sentiments which his heart tells him are good and holy. Instead of the vague stare of a figure, which, but for a pair of keys or a sword in its hand, might as well represent Pontius Pilate as an apostle, one now expects dignity of attitude, nobleness of features, holiness of expression, majesty of action. Instead of the unmeaning beauty of feature (if even this) by which the best attempts at a *Madonna* were characterized, no one is satisfied without an approach at least to the sweetness, the grace, the purity, and the queenly grandeur that befit the Virgin-Mother of God. In like manner we now desire and expect to see, in the representation of sacred histories, the simplicity of action, naturalness of arrangement, and power of expression, which enables the eye to read them, and the feelings to apprehend them—the truest test of real religious art. We are alive to that holy, calm, and quiet

* While on every other article subject to duty, ten per cent is the average rate of duty, on prints it still continues to be a penny each. This is a trifle upon large and expensive engravings, but on the Düsseldorf prints which cost only one penny, it amounts to 100 per cent. Having imported a large number, chiefly for distribution among the poor, we had to pay £.25 for duty, and appealed, in vain, to the inexorable Vandalism of financial officials.

beauty which pervades the compositions of the older Italian and modern German masters, where one can almost divine what each person is saying and thinking, as well as one can see what he is doing.

It may be said that all these observations apply only to Catholics, and afford no indication of a similar taste springing up in the country in general. Perhaps not; although at the same time we sincerely believe that symptoms of it are appearing among the people in general. We shall have more to say presently on the subject. But, first, we are anxious to express our opinion on some matters connected with our subject; premising that we are most anxious to avoid every cause of offence. We must observe, therefore, that we are writing entirely about the arts of design, and principally on painting and drawing, though many of our observations will apply likewise to sculpture and carving. We say, then, that the taste and feeling for Christian art, to which we have alluded, must not be confounded with the architectural movement, which, however valuable in itself, goes upon different principles, and, in some respects, may be considered as discouraging of what we wish to see revived in art. The *tendency* of architectural movements is to return to given models, and to reproduce, as nearly as possible, the works of other times. This is the case with every sort of architecture. If a man revive Egyptian patterns, he must needs introduce sphynxes and hieroglyphics, though they are worse than absolute nonsense; and the restorers of Grecian architecture give us most punctually the wreathed skulls of victims, the pateræ, and other heathen symbols, devoid of meaning, and of beauty, too, when out of place. The better ecclesiological movement which has taken place in England (most happily, we own) has a similar, though better directed, tendency to reproduce the rudenesses, and even deformities, of past ages. It so happened, by a very obvious process, that the various branches of what are called the fine arts did not develop equally in any country; that while architecture, for instance, in England and France had reached its prime of matchless beauty, drawing and painting were not equally advanced: hence, splendid canopies overshadow but indifferent figures, and the few remains which we have of painting present but inferior specimens of conception or design. Unfortunately in copying, as they deserve, the architectural monuments

of our forefathers, we have taken to admire, and even to copy, their very unequal embellishments in the way of sculpture and drawing.

But this is not even the worst: we have almost canonized defects, and sanctified monstrosities. What was the result of ignorance or unskilfulness, we attribute to some mysterious influence or deep design. A few terms give sanction and authority to any outrageousness in form, anatomy, or position; to stiffness, hardness, meagreness, unexpressiveness—nay, to impossibilities in the present structure of the human frame. Feet twisted round, fingers in wrong order on the hand, heads inverted on their shoulders, distorted features, squinting eyes, grotesque postures, bodies stretched out as if taken from the rack, enormously elongated extremities, grimness of features, fierceness of expression, and an atrocious contradiction to the anatomical structure of man,—where this is displayed, are not only allowed to pass current, but are published in the transactions of Societies, are copied into stained glass, images, and prints, and are called “mystical,” or “symbolical,” or “conventional” forms and representations. And this is enough to get things praised and admired, which can barely be tolerated by allowance for the rudeness of their own age. We have seen representations of saints such as we honestly declare we should be sorry to meet in flesh and blood, with the reality of their emblematic sword or club about them, on the highway at evening. And because these were the productions of an *age* eminently Catholic, they are considered as the types of an *art* equally so. But religious art does not look at time, but at nature, which changes not, and at religion, which is equally immutable. To make rude carvings because the building on which they are placed is Norman, or to make a stiff design because the glass is framed in early English tracery, may be all quite characteristic, but it is not artistic. The object of all art is to speak to the eye, and, through it, to the feelings; and the object of religious art is consequently to excite, through the sight, religious emotions adequate to the subjects or persons represented. It is not intended that the spectator should have to say, “How well the Norman style is carried out even in the carvings!” or, “How admirably the glass of Edward the Fourth’s time has been imitated!” or, “One could really fancy that crucifixion to have been painted in the thirteenth century!”

but it is to be desired and aimed at, that the beholder, antiquarian or simple, scholar or peasant, should at once feel himself penetrated with a sense of the beautifully holy, be enamoured of the virtues which beam from the face and seem to clothe the form of the figure before him, that from earthly comeliness his thoughts should rise to the contemplation of heavenly charms; that he should at once weep or exult, be humbled or gain confidence as he gazes,—not to study or criticise, but to feel.

While, therefore, we will join to the full pitch of our voice in the cry of condemnation that has been raised against all that is frivolous, trumpery, and trivial in sacred art; while we utterly anathematize all representations of the Immaculate Mother in modern Parisian fashions, and of angels in the attitudes of a posture-master, we are not prepared to admire a figure of the former merely because enveloped in a diapered mantle, nor of the latter simply because he wears a cope. We want more than these accessories, however valuable; we want truth, according to our noblest conceptions. The devout mind loves to contemplate the Incarnate Glory of heaven as the type of dignified and hallowed beauty—as the “*speciosus forma præ filiis hominum*,” figuring in Himself all that humanity could ever contain of outward comeliness as expressive of inward perfection. He was a man—“*in similitudinem hominum factus, et habitu inventus ut homo*”—and therefore he is to be represented with features, limbs, bones, muscles, and sinews like those of other men. But whether as an infant, or as a youth, or as grown to full manhood—at Bethlehem, Nazareth, Jerusalem, or Calvary—His effigy must be to the eye (so far as art can portray it) what loving thought of Him is to the soul, the combination of all that is nobly beautiful. Even in the agonies of death, even extended on the cross, the eye of faith, and consequently the eye of christian art, cannot contemplate Him otherwise. We are repulsed, therefore, rather than attracted, by those mediæval representations of Him, which place before us a body painfully extenuated, with ill-proportioned or distorted limbs, and with a haggard, if not an ill-favoured, countenance; nor are we gained to admiration by being told, that such an effigy is more mystical or symbolical. For we cannot see how mysticism should require that which is supremely fair to be set forth as ugly, nor how

external disproportion or uncomeliness should be the right-ful symbol of what is infinite perfection,—

“Quæcumque ostendis mihi sic incredulus odi.”

And in like manner, we have no toleration for any intended likeness of His Virgin-Mother, which exhibits her other than as the “*tota pulchra Maria*” of the Church’s song. Sweet, graceful, maidenly in countenance and carriage we wish to see her ever represented; full of peace, benignity, and cheering joy, whether smiling on her own infant or on us; blending the Mother and the Virgin only by the tempering with majesty of the unfading bloom of celestial charms.

Strange indeed, it may seem, that while the mental type of this unparalleled Being should have been so clearly, so sublimely brought out by a Bernard, its artistic type should have been locked up in the hard and dark delineations of the Byzantine school, waiting as it were for a germ of life to bring them into the warm and bright existence of the Christian school. But this only proves what we have before remarked, that the various arts developed at different periods; and thus the poetry of religion opened into blossom before its painting.

What we have already written may suffice to explain our conviction that if a Catholic school of art has to be raised in England, it must be, not only independent of the architectural school which has been formed, but on principles totally different from those on which this is based. First, it must not set out with the idea of mere reproduction, or of copying older masters, or of having a warrant and authority for every thing it does. In other words, a school of Christian art, to succeed, must not be an antiquarian establishment. It must start on the principle that it is essentially a creative art, that it must invent as well as the old masters did, that it must study them and cull out their excellencies, but must not servilely copy them: it may imitate, but not transcribe. Hence we must have no Saxon, or mediæval, or Gothic, or cinquecento styles, but a pure Christian style, wherever and whenever it has to be used.

Secondly, the work must begin from the beginning. Till now, we have taken an old brass, or an old window,*

* We must gratefully acknowledge however that a great improve-

or an old statue; we have rubbed the one, traced the other, and pressed or moulded the third, and have got artists that could copy exactly. But this is not art. We can thus indeed create clever workmen, and accurate imitators; but we give them no principles, and they can never materially get beyond what they find. The study of Christian art must begin where every other branch begins; by accurate drawing, by studies from nature, and then by studying and copying the best models, chastening and purifying as it proceeds, the mere animal forms and traits, and drawing out and learning to embody those characters, expressions, and feelings, which belong to religion as distinct from nature, and to the inward, rather than to the outward, life.

Now this last can only be done by three different means combined. The first is the study, to which we have already alluded, of the great Catholic masters of every country, particularly of Italy. The second is the use of proper models. Academical models will do well enough for anatomy and attitude; and a lay-figure will answer for hanging on drapery; but the living characteristics of Christian art, expression not merely of features, but of form, must be sought among those whose lives exhibit the practice, and consequently whose exterior presents the type, of the virtues to be represented. For, as was intimated above, truth must be the aim of art; and, thank God, in the Catholic Church the type of art is not ideal, in a strict sense, but real. The older artists may have elevated and purified the models which they used, but they nevertheless did not invent them. They found them in the Church, and they formed their style upon them. And in the same place the Catholic artist must look for the same guidance. He will still find his St. Brunos, as Zurbeyran did, among his disciples the Carthusians, and his St. Bernards among the Cistercians; and he will be surprised to see again and again, before and round the altar, the attitudes, the arrangements, and even the countenances and bearing of figures and groups, which have

ment has been visible of late in the stained glass, in respect to accurate drawing, breadth, and expression, especially in that designed by Mr. Pugin, and executed by Mr. Hardman, of Birmingham. Still much remains to be done.

appeared to him masterly inventions, when seen in the old masters.

But the third means, and the principal one, by which any one can hope to attain the true principles and practice of religious art, is meditation and devout study of its objects, joined to holiness of life and the attempt, at least, to realise in himself the character that he wishes to depict. Without this, all other efforts are vain. We wish the full extent of the cost to be known by those who may be gloriously bold enough to bid for this crown. We may easily have a school of religious naturalists, such as interrupted the succession of great artists in Italy, and such as France now has; men who, by combining natural beauty with studied attitude, have fancied, if they thought at all about it, that they were painting saints. Such men may call themselves religious and Catholic artists, but they will never accomplish anything worthy of the name: they will be cold, insipid, and eventually mannered. We have been struck with the character and even appearance of the modern Catholic artists of Germany: no one can know them without seeing at once that they believe in all that they express, that their hearts go with their hands in their work, that they are impressed with the feeling that what they are doing is a holy thing. It would be invidious, and hardly delicate to mention names: but let any one make the acquaintance of the principal Catholic painters at Rome; or let any lover of the arts, who is making the usual trip of the Rhine, stop to visit the splendid church built by Count Fürstenberg at Apollinarisberg, near Bonn, and converse with the Düsseldorf academicians engaged on its beautiful frescoes, and we are sure he will be satisfied, that the work which he admires is the fruit of sincere faith and religious meditation.

But if the artist looks back for his models among the great religious painters of the middle ages, he will find, not mere piety but, absolute sanctity become the guarantee of success in its perfection. The connection between the two—between perfection in virtue (where abilities are not deficient) and perfection in christian art—becomes demonstrated, as well as exhibited, in the Blessed Giovanni, or, as he is oftener called, Angelico da Fiesoli. We will quote his character as given by Vasari, whose own style, life, and disposition, were diametrically opposite to his.

"He was simple, and most holy in his manners,—and let this serve for token of his simplicity, that Pope Nicholas one morning offering him refreshment, he scrupled to eat flesh without the license of his Superior, forgetful for the moment of the dispensing authority of the Pontiff. He shunned altogether the commerce of the world, and living in holiness and in purity, was as loving towards the poor on earth as I think his soul must now be in heaven. He worked incessantly at his art, nor would he ever paint other than sacred subjects. He might have been rich but cared not to be so, saying that true riches consisted rather in being content with little. He might have ruled over many, but willed it not, saying there was less trouble and hazard of sin in obeying others. Dignity and authority were within his grasp, but he disregarded them, affirming that he sought no other advancement than to escape Hell and draw near to Paradise. He was most meek and temperate, and by a chaste life loosened himself from the snares of the world, oft-times saying that the student of painting had need of quiet and to live without anxiety, and that the dealer in the things of Christ ought to dwell habitually with Christ. Never was he seen in anger with the brethren, which appears to me a thing most marvellous, and all but incredible; his admonitions to his friends were simple and always softened by a smile. Whoever sought to employ him, he answered with the utmost courtesy, that he would do his part willingly so the prior were content. In sum, this never sufficiently to be lauded father was most humble and modest in all his words and deeds, and in his paintings graceful and devout, and the saints which he painted have more of the air and aspect of saints than those of any other artist. He was wont never to retouch or amend any of his paintings, but left them always as they had come from his hand at first; believing, as he said, that such was the will of God. Some say that he never took up his pencils without previous prayer. He never painted a crucifix without tears bathing his cheeks; and throughout his works, in the countenance and attitude of all his figures, the correspondent impress of his sincere and exalted appreciation of the Christian religion is recognisable. 'Such,' adds Vasari, 'was this verily angelic father, who spent the whole of his time in the service of God and in doing good to the world and to his neighbour. And truly a gift (virtù) like his could not descend on any but a man of most saintly life; for a painter must be holy himself before he can depict holiness.'"—pp. 195-6-7.

We have given this character by Vasari from Lord Lindsay's work; and we are sure we shall further illustrate our subject by another extract, in which the noble author describes the results of the saintly character, as

exhibited on the artist's canvas. The following is his description of B. Angelico's chief excellence.

"Expression, accordingly—the special exponent of Spirit, as Form is of Intellect, and Colour of Sense—is the peculiar prerogative of Fra Angelico. Ecstasy and enthusiasm were his native element, and the emotions of his heart animated his pencil with a tenderness and repose, a love and a peace in which no one has yet excelled or even equalled him. These are the unvarying characteristics of the Madonna in his paintings. The true theory of her likeness presumes her outward form to have been so exquisitely moulded and etherialized by inward purity and habitual converse with heaven, that Gabriel might have known her among mankind by her face alone, had he been in search of her with no other token. Subsequently to the Nativity, the mother's love must be supposed to blend with the innocence of the Virgin, and a beauty to result from the union, combining the holiness and purity of both estates, as inconceivable as that union itself was supernatural. Hence evidently, an Ideal for the artist's imagination, impossible of attainment, but which he will ever seek after, whether by spiritualizing the lineaments of her most dear to him, or by appropriating and reanimating some one of the many ancient portraitures of the Virgin,—for there is no one fixed traditional resemblance, as of our Saviour. Every great painter, accordingly has his distinctive type, born (for the most part) of his domestic affections,—daughters of loveliness are they, sweet as the rose, pure as the dew, capable of the holiest and loftiest of thoughts, but in almost every instance marked with an individuality which distresses the imagination, while the absence of that individuality as invariably infers vagueness and insipidity. Now the peculiarity and merit (as it appears to me) of Fra Angelico is, that his Virgins are neither vague nor individual,—even while doing nothing, they breathe of heaven in their repose—they are visible incarnations of the beauty of holiness, and yet not mere abstractions—they are most emphatically feminine—the ideal of womanhood as the chosen temple of the Trinity; they are to the Madonnas of other painters what Eve may be supposed to have been to her daughters before the Fall—their lineaments seem to include all other likenesses, to assume to each several votary the semblance he loves most to gaze upon. It was because Fra Angelico's whole life was love—diverted by his vow of celibacy from any specific object, that his imagination thus sought for and found inspiration in heaven. Next to the Madonna, I may mention the heads of our Saviour, of the Apostles and Saints in Fra Angelico's pictures, as excelling in expression and beauty, as well as those of the elect, in his representations of the Last Judgment; his delineations of the worldly, the wicked, the reprobate, are uniformly feeble and inadequate; his success or

failure is always proportioned to his moral sympathy or distaste."*—pp. 191-2-3.

Let us, then, at once draw our conclusion. We must not expect, nor ought we to desire, the formation of a religious school of art otherwise than by the formation of a school of *religious artists*—that is, of men who will do their work with faith and for love, whose outward performances will be only counterparts of an inward devotion, so that what they strive to represent in form and colour shall be the visions of their own pious meditations, and the fruit of their constant conversation with things spiritual and holy.

We have before said, that a school of christian art must spring up under the conviction that this is creative, and not merely imitative; and this may call for some explanation here. There is a medium to be kept, not binding on the pursuer of any other branch of art: the one between traditional modes and original ideas. Here, too, we are in danger of being cramped by prejudices in favour of the mere antique. It is certain, indeed, that the first revivers of painting, how much soever they cultivated and perfected design, colouring, and expression, allowed themselves to be severely fettered in regard to composition by the standard or traditional manner of representing given subjects; so as to have departed but slowly and cautiously from the stiff and formal arrangement of a preceding period. This is easily accounted for. They painted essentially *for the people*. Let that never be forgotten. Their pictures might be ordered by a prince or a wealthy merchant, but it was never with a view of putting them into a gallery, only to be opened by a ticket or a shilling, but to be hung over some altar, or to adorn the walls of a cloister, or perhaps a public hall. They painted, therefore, so that the people should at once understand their pictures, and therefore as they had been accustomed to see the subjects

* One of the most beautiful productions of B. Angelico's pencil is his Last Judgment, in the gallery of the late Cardinal Fesch. Lord Lindsay has described it. (vol. iii. p. 187.) It was bought in, at the sale of the Cardinal's pictures, by his nephew, the Prince of Canino; and has just been purchased from him by Lord Ward. This will be a most valuable addition to the small share of specimens of Christian art possessed by England.

treated. To have left out, or violently displaced, figures which always formed part of a subject, would have been to disturb the habitual train of thought, and consequently the devotion, of those who came to be edified and to pray before them. And here let us pause for one moment, to express our feeling of how glorious a sight must have been presented by one of the churches of Florence or Siena (and we might add other cities) when the altarpieces of the old masters, which yet in part adorn them, were all fresh, not merely in their gold and paint, but in that heavenly sweetness of expression which, even in their present faded state, beams from their pannels. But, still, the observer will note the formality of composition that gives them a family resemblance, though otherwise belonging to different authors, nay, to different schools and ages. For, from Giotto to Pietro Perugino, the same rules on this portion of art prevailed.

The reason which we have given, will sufficiently account for this. At the same time it is clear that every advance in correctness of design, beauty, and harmony of colour, and above all in perfection of expression, would please naturally, even those who could not discover the cause of their emotions, or would only increase and deepen those feelings which the same subject inferiorly treated had before produced. No one would quarrel with a picture because the Blessed Virgin in it was more lovely, or the infant on her knees more divine, or the saints on either side more devout; but many would have perhaps murmured, had a change taken place in the ordinary disposition of these figures, and had the mother and child been transferred from the post of honour to one side of the composition, as we find it later in Corregio or Guido. But these traditions of ancient Christian art have been totally broken, and there are no associations in existing monuments around us and before the people, nor in devotional forms of conception familiar through preaching or meditation, to give them now any particular empire over the affections of beholders, or over the standard rules of composition. To bind Christian art on its revival, to the conventional forms of representation admitted in old times, would be a groundless tyranny, and in fact would tend to strangle it in its very cradle. In this respect we think the Germans have given us a useful lesson, and we should be prepared to follow it. We have no hesitation in stating

our conviction, that however short the best modern Catholic artists may fall, in giving that truly devout and heavenly character to individual figures, which belongs to the older masters, they have gained upon them, (regard being had to the character of our age,) in the giving of more action and more varied expression to subjects that naturally require it, in bringing forward as subjects for art, events and circumstances which, for the reasons above given, were not handled by the more ancient artists; and finally, in conceiving new and often most exquisite representations of subjects often before treated. We shall perhaps shock the antiquarian artist by such an avowal; but we shall do no good with art in this country till many prejudices are broken down. We will put one case. Let a modern artist be desired to paint the *Sposalizio*, or espousal of Mary to Joseph, and that for a public church. Would he venture to take the old type, such as Pietro and Raffaello have given it in their exquisite pictures of this subject, based, that is, on the traditional history of the blossoming rod of Joseph? would he introduce the youth breaking his barren rod over his knee? If he did, who in a thousand, that looked on it, would understand it? And if a long explanation were given, would that move to piety which is not based on any belief? At the time, and in the country, of those older artists, the history was at any rate known; the tradition was alive, the spectators understood the meaning of each circumstance. Now and here, the chain has been broken, and would it be profitable to reconnect it? Nay, could one hope to gain any advancement in piety and faith, by endeavouring to revive the knowledge of an uncertain legend? But who could fail to understand and to appreciate, nay to be moved by Overbeck's conception of the subject; espousals so pure and so unearthly, that no witnesses are there but angels, so that the whole function is one of heaven heavenly, without example and without imitation? We could multiply instances of what will be admitted by all to be purer and sublimer conceptions of scenes in our Saviour's life by modern than by older artists, but we remember having given several in one of our first numbers.* Then as to new subjects, not anciently treated, but worked out by meditation and earnest thoughtfulness, the illustrious artist already mentioned and his many fol-

* Vol. i. p. 459.

lowers, among whom Steinle must hold a distinguished place, would furnish us with abundant examples: but fortunately we have one to our purpose nearer home. This year's Catalogue of the Royal Academy's annual exhibition, contains a picture (No. 130.) which cannot fail to arrest the eye of every visitor of that collection. It is Mr. Herbert's picture of our Saviour, subject to His parents at Nazareth. It represents a circumstance, which, though not historical, is not merely possible, but highly probable. Some wood, thrown on the ground beside Joseph's humble workshop, has formed a cross. This naturally lights up a train of thought in the mind of the Divine Youth, who stands for a moment as if fixed in a painful trance, while His Mother, who lays up every look, as every word, in her heart, gazes on Him, with work suspended, in intense and loving, and therefore sympathising, interest. Here is a subject, which every one will at once acknowledge to be worthy of the pencil of any truly christian artist. To the mere Bible-christian it may appear fanciful: but not so to the Catholic. Long before Mr. Herbert's successful attempt to give it outward life by design and colour, it had suggested itself to the devout meditation of the most tender, the most poetical, and the most sweetly loving of the ancient Fathers, St. Ephrem, the Syrian. It will not be long, we trust, before we call our reader's attention to the admirable and most learned translation of his Rhythms, just published by the Rev. J. B. Morris, late of Exeter College, Oxford, and now of St. Mary's, Oscott; but we trust that, in the meantime, no Catholic who can procure the book will fail to feast his devotion on its delightful stores of spiritual refreshment. In the seventeenth Rhythm we meet with this remarkable passage: "Hail, Son of the Creator! hail to the Son of the carpenter! who, when creating, created everything in the mystery of the cross! And haply, even in the house of Joseph that carpenter, with the cross He was busied all the day."* Thus we have a Father of the fourth century considering it probable that our Blessed Saviour, from passing His early youth in a carpenter's house, would have the thought of the cross constantly brought before His mind.

Such is the subject on which Mr. Herbert has happily

* Select Works of S. Ephrem the Syrian. Oxford, Parker, 1847, p. 164.

seized, though unconscious of so early a precedent, and the concurrent voice of artists and critics gives evidence of his success. Nothing can be more simple than the composition of the picture: there is no effort at strong effects by combinations. Each figure is apart, detached, so as to claim, and actually receive, separate and successive attention. The attitudes are singularly simple, natural, and unstudied; drawn and painted with a delicate accuracy, not merely of outline, but of fold, feature, and smallest lineament—a precaution absolutely necessary where the artist invites the eye to the careful observation of each figure in its detail. Nor is there anything in the accessories to divide the attention. The landscape, copied from the present arid reality of Nazareth, is stern, unvaried, and undistracting: so that the entire attention is concentrated on the figures, and principally on One. The expression of this is, to our minds, a little too overcast with pain: but this is a comparatively slight defect amidst the beauties of the piece. Its great merit is decidedly the direct appeal which it makes, through expression, to religious feelings, while it simply tells its whole history to the observer, and enables him to enter fully into the part acted by each Person represented. It requires no book learning to understand, to comprehend, and to feel it; it cannot make any but one impression, a tender and devout one; it will leave a quiet and calm reflection of itself on the mind, which will not be effaced by the ghastly brilliancy of Turner's incomprehensible dreams, nor by the warm and feeling exhibition of religious chivalry in Etty's noble painting. All this is in accordance with what we wish to see in a true religious school of art.

But we have almost lost sight of the subject, directly in view, when we mentioned Mr. Herbert's picture; though our reason for entering so fully into it will appear just now. We were anxious to impress upon our readers the importance of looking upon religious art as a creative power, not as a servile imitator of what have been called "conventional" or "traditional" forms. This picture we quoted as an instance of the possibility, even in this degenerate age, of finding subjects not treated before, and making them fit vehicles for the conveying to the mind of believers most religious impressions. We repeat, therefore, that to such traditional forms as belong purely to art and not to religion—that is, the tradition for which is not any

doctrine, or even pious belief handed down by the Church, but merely a practice of copying from an antecedent and ruder period, we do not think that artists should be bound in a country like ours, where the very existence of such traditions has been lost, and where the reproduction could only cause misunderstanding, and would be equivalent to a new creation.

But, as we remarked, it is necessary to keep a medium; so as not to depart too far from certain conventional forms and modes of representation — such, that is, as have a ground in ecclesiastical learning, and have a truth about them that would soon be intelligible. And this, we conceive, would be one of the advantages of a recognized Catholic school of art in England, as it certainly has been in Germany: that many being trained on given principles, they would have their individual fancies checked, and gradually such forms and characters of religious representations would be established as would at once be intelligible to all, and yet be conformable to all real traditions, and even to all well-grounded conventions, in matters where some rule is necessary. Perhaps a few examples will best explain our meaning. 1. We would, then, for instance, have strict regard paid to the symbols of the saints, such as partly history and partly tradition has appointed them. The instruments of their martyrdom, the emblems of their dignity, the representation of some great work (as a church), or an object allusive to their occupation, are fitting modes of giving those holy personages individual character. St. Peter should not be deprived of his keys, nor St. Lawrence of his gridiron, nor St. Catherine of her wheel, nor St. Agnes of her lamb, nor St. Jerome of his lion, by any innovation of art. Such symbolism is at once natural, intelligible, and historical. We believe that these saints, were they to appear in vision, would make themselves cognizable by these, their respective, badges. 2. The same we would say respecting the insignia of office or robes, distinctive of ecclesiastical dignity. Too severe an attention to historical costume would be pedantic, fatiguing, and perplexing. It is true, a bishop of the third century did not wear a cope and mitre of the same form as now are in use; but these have become the well known emblems and garments of persons in that office, and as such should be given to pontiffs who, though they lived ages ago on

earth, are represented to the piety of the faithful as living in heaven now.

In the public square at Milan is a statue in marble, of modern sculpture, representing a person in a Roman toga; and we remember being almost shocked on being told, in answer to an enquiry, that it represented St. Ambrose. We could not give assent to our friendly and learned guide's arguments, that this was the *truer* representation. We could not bear to see the saint otherwise than as a bishop. In like manner, we would have the raiment of the celestial hierarchy, where they appear upon earth copied from that of the Church here below. For the angels are represented to us as ministering at the altar in heaven, and our faith teaches us to consider the triumphant and the militant, but as portions of one indivisible Church, and those blessed spirits as fellow-ministers with our visible priesthood. Moreover, the eye of the faithful is accustomed to associate the ecclesiastical garments, used only at the altar, as the most sacred of outward apparel, and more dignified, in truth, than the most splendid distinctions of mere secular rank.

3. We would have due observance of the appropriation of established colours in the draperies of Our Divine Saviour, our Blessed Lady, and other Saints. For the eye has been accustomed to the choice, and it is in itself appropriate; and every one would be offended at mixed and fancy colours being applied to such figures. In the same manner, we should never object, (in pictures not meant for historical, but for devotional,) to a richness being given to these accessories of a picture, such as certainly never existed. But in this respect too, we would have great sobriety of taste.

4. Where there is no certain belief or tradition to guide us, and the one followed by old artists is natural and devout, we should deprecate departure from this. For instance, in the Annunciation, the Blessed Virgin is always represented as at prayer, or as rising from prayer, when the angel enters. We should be sorry to see an attempt to alter this, and to have the mystery take place, while any meaner or more homely occupation was going on. But we cannot reconcile ourselves to adherence to certain forms, merely because they are old; as our Saviour at his resurrection, springing from a coffin which could not hold half His body; or as an infant attended by an ox and

an ass of most extraordinary species, not larger than lap-dogs; or standing in the air, (of which we have specimens at hand;) or in the transit of our Lady made like the death-bed of one whose salvation might be doubtful, where every appliance of anxious piety is made by the attendant apostles, instead of them and us gazing in silent awe and edification at the passage of that sinless soul from its spotless tabernacle to the bosom of its Lord. No amount of precedent even from the most hallowed names, will ever make us submit to such traditionary modes.

Our readers will however see, that our concessions to established usages, are sufficiently ample to secure their being preserved, where intelligible and really good.

Having now discharged our consciences of what perhaps many will not wholly approve, but having at the same time, we are sure, cleared the ground of prejudices, which have stood powerfully in the way of engaging real artists to attempt the foundation of a religious school, we proceed to a more pleasing portion of our undertaking.

We stated, almost at the outset, that we thought there were indications of a rising feeling for true religious art among the people. Though the evidences may appear slight, it is fair to state them. First, the reference which we have made to Mr. Herbert's picture affords us one. It must have struck every one, who follows the course of public opinion on such matters, that this painting has met with universal, and almost with unbounded praise. Without distinction of religious character, every paper that has mentioned it, has spoken of it as one of the most beautiful of the exhibition. Nor is this all, it has rivetted the gaze, and won the admiration of the multitudes that have flocked around it; nor have we heard of any feelings expressed before it, but such as proved how completely it addressed itself at once to the minds and hearts of the people. This we own has given us almost our first ray of hope on the practical possibility of establishing a Catholic school of art. When there is sentiment enough in the people to appreciate so peculiar a subject treated so quietly, so differently from what they are accustomed to on the walls of the Royal Academy, we have secured to us the basis, the *priming*, if we may so speak, upon which Christian art can work.

But further let us remark, that similar taste has been

shown in other ways. Thus we have been struck with the evident manner in which the splendid *Francias* in the National Gallery arrests the eye of those who visit that collection, although they present neither intensity of action, nay, nor action at all, nor subjects with which the English mind is familiar. But while passing by the awful and stern magnificence of *Sebastiano's* masterpiece, which few can prize, we see young and old won by the soft and sweet radiance of the angels mourning over the sacred corpse of their Lord, feeling, if they do not fully comprehend, the essentially Catholic spirituality of the scene, and the deep mysteries which it conceals.

We could add some other reasons for our opinion; but it is not necessary. For it would be folly to expect any strong demonstration in favour of a branch of art, which does not as yet exist on a scale to permit it. Not one Englishman in ten thousand has an opportunity of seeing a truly religious painting; not one in ten times that number of seeing so many and such as can form his taste, and enable him to appreciate this highest department of art. All that we can reasonably expect, therefore, is that, in proportion as opportunities are afforded for trial, the result is favourable; and the instances mentioned are enough for this. Development must be the work of time. Let us but give to the English public but one such chance of showing its taste, as the King of Bavaria has done at Munich, or is doing at Spire; let us throw open one good church, glowing from its ceiling to its lower panneling, not with diaper and mere colour, not even with single figures in separate compartments, but with a series of large and simple histories, comprising the chief Gospel mysteries and the life of the Blessed Virgin or any other great Saint; let expression of the most refined and dignified character reign in every head and countenance; let the tints be harmonious, grave, yet warm and bright; let holiness and calm reign through every part; and we shall soon see, first, whether the English heart is not as fully attuned to the sentiment of the beautiful and delicate in art as that of any other nation; and, secondly, whether encouragement will not spring up on all sides for this higher sphere of art, enough both to give employment to all formed artists, and to enkindle genius that otherwise might for ever have wanted life. To expect more than this would be as absurd as to suppose, that a love of naval life and glory could

exist in an inland tribe of Africa, that had never seen a ship.

Now comes the great question, Is this practicable? Is it hopeful? How is this first effort to be made? How is this first specimen to be given? We could answer by following up our illustration, and say, "Do as the Romans did when they determined to rival the Carthagenians at sea. They took the wreck of a galley cast on their shore, and copied it, and they trained their future sailors on dry land. Begin by imitating the works of others; take your models and examples from abroad. *Fiat experimentum in corpore vili*; try on a small scale, and produce something less perfect to begin with." But this will never do. We must begin with something great and noble at once. Christian art must not come out before the public, for the first time, mean and imperfect. Her unfledged efforts at flight must be sacred, in the retreat of the academy or the *studio*. On the walls of the sanctuary she must appear bright, golden, queen-like, from the first,—fit associate for adoring angels and heavenly mysteries. Are we, then, dreaming of some chimera, the brood of an over-heated imagination? On the contrary, we are writing on what we believe—dare we say, intend?—to be a most practical and a most certain result.

Lord Lindsay, at the conclusion of his work, asks this significant question: "And why despair of this," (of painting like Raphael and Michael Angelo,) "or even of shaming the Vatican? For with genius and God's blessing nothing is impossible." (vol. iii. p. 420.) Now to this we answer, that without presumption it may be really said, that the blessing of genius for christian art is not one which it has pleased the Almighty to give out of the Catholic Church. No Protestant country has yet produced a religious artist of any sort; every Catholic one has produced a school. Account for it as you please, the fact stands hard and incontrovertible; and as such it has two faces—it looks to the future as well as to the past. Protestantism is barren as to religious art; and Lord Lindsay's book gives us additional proof, if we wanted it, of this truth. We shall not be departing from our subject by a few paragraphs in evidence of this.

Protestantism is essentially irreverent; and Lord Lindsay's work, great as is its merit, shows it. He begins it by a long preface on "Christian *Mythology*!" And this

is synonymous with "the materials of christian art during the middle ages." Imagine the possibility of a school of art springing up among a sect, who, while they pretend to copy or rival old art, consider its materials—a *mythology*! Can their artists be expected to look on it with more reverence, or to treat its subjects with more feeling, than they would those of Grecian or of Egyptian mythology? But just let us look at some of these mythologies. The torments of hell, as painted in the middle ages, were suggested by Buddhist doctrines! (vol. i. p. xxxiii.) The origin of the nine orders or choirs that compose the heavenly hierarchy, from seraphim to angels, (though each is mentioned by St. Paul, and from him the order is drawn by the Fathers,) "must be sought for apparently in the remote east, among the Chaldeans and Medo-Persians!" (p. xxxiv.) The Nativity and Presentation of the Blessed Virgin (p. xl.), her woes at the foot of the Cross (p. l.) are all mythologies! as is her Assumption! (p. lxii.) The same is to be said of the Discovery of the Cross, of its Exaltation, and of many other historical subjects. But we are not left merely to induction for our conclusion that Protestantism is void of that reverence, which is as necessary an ingredient in religious art as oil or some other vehicle is in the composition of its colours. Lord Lindsay's language in speaking of these subjects is blasphemously irreverent, nay even to Anglicanism heterodox. He tells us that the apocryphal gospels may be traced to Leucius, a Gnostic heretic, who forged them chiefly "with a view of supporting the *peculiar tenets of the sect*, namely.....*that the Blessed Mary was ever Virgin*," &c. "The *early Church*," he adds, "in rejecting the leading principle of the heresy, and condemning the heretics, sanctioned, or at least winked at, the circulation of the fables devised by them in its support, and these have become the mythology of Christianity.....while many of the dogmas which they were grounded upon have crept into the faith." (p. xl.) The belief therefore in the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Mother of God is, according to Lord Lindsay, a *peculiar tenet* of Gnosticism, which has crept into the Church! Again, "The transfer to her" (the Blessed Virgin) "of the popular veneration for a female deity, whether Diana, Astarte, or Isis, universally current among the Southern nations, is the key to the whole mystery of her various representa-

tion in early art." (p. lxiii.) We pass over other similarly afflicting passages: for these will suffice. If the enthusiastic admirer of early Christian art can thus think of all that inspired it, and looks upon it with the irreverent eyes, and speaks of it with the flippant tongue, wherewith he might approach the abominations of heathen fable, what hope can there be that the religion (*sit verbo venia*) which can generate such feelings, will ever give birth to any noble or tender inspirations of that very art? In the next place, Protestantism, as regards art, is essentially unholy. Two characteristics of holiness pervade pictorial art, which at once distinguish its figures from those of its profane or secular sister—austerity and purity. The entire outline of body is corrected and ætherialized by the former, the countenance is sweetened and irradiated by the latter. Disconnect the idea of holiness from these; assume that a Saint is not of necessity a mortified and self-denying character, and that chastity or purity is not the virtue which makes angels of men, and you may indeed have a school of religious painting, that will riot in masses of gross flesh and most unsaintly countenances, like Rubens, but not what Lord Lindsay asks for, men who will paint like Pietro Perugino and Luca Signorelli. Now his lordship, speaking no doubt the language of the future patrons of English Christian art, has clearly recorded his own views on the subject of these very virtues. In the passage above quoted, the doctrine of mortification is enumerated among Gnostic errors. But further on the whole Catholic doctrine of "the ascetic or angelic life" is characterised in terms of opprobrious condemnation, (p. civ.) which we will attribute to ignorance of its true nature rather than to any worse motive. But his attack upon the Catholic virtue of chastity will at once satisfy us of the utter hopelessness of the revival which he contemplates. It is as follows:

"This fresco needs little comment. I need not remind you that the chastity thus commended is that which brands our wives and mothers with a slur—nor dwell upon the melancholy consequences to human virtue and happiness entailed by the fatal and most unscriptural restriction of the idea, and the term to virginity and celibacy,—a delusion of most ancient date, and inherited alike by the Mystics of the East and the West, the Buddhists and the Gnostics,—the latter of whom, more especially, referred the origin of sin to the creation of matter, the creation of matter to the Evil

Principle—and identified that Evil Principle with Jehovah! St. Francis shared to the full in the agonies of the early ascetics,*—it is a subject that can but be alluded to.—May God in His mercy shield us from such horrors in England!"—Vol. ii. p. 225.

Let any artist imbued with these notions sit down to meditate upon the countenance which he would give to a "Virgin-Saint," whose chief characteristic must be the virtue thus unchristianly denounced beaming from every feature. As to his attempting to depict the queen of Virgins, to set forth the lily, after he has scorned its whiteness, we defy him.

Furthermore, Protestantism presents no types of Christian art. It has destroyed the types of the past. It excludes as legendary all the most beautiful histories of the early saints: it has quenched all sympathy for the favourite themes of mediæval painting, the Fathers of the desert, St. Benedict, and the great monastic heroes, and still more the inspirer, and the maturer of art, and of its poetry, the glorious St. Francis of Assisium. And as to the present, it allows no communion with Saints in heaven, and consequently no interest in having their effigies before our eyes: no loving intercourse with blessed Spirits, and therefore no right to bring them visibly into action. All ecstasy, supernatural contemplation, vision, and rapturous prayer, with the only approach to heavenly expression that earth can give; all miracles and marvellous occurrences, with the store of incident which they supply, all mingling in any one scene of the living and the Blessed, the past and the present—in fine, all the poetry of art is coldly cut out, nay, strangled and quenched by the hard hand of protestantism.

And as to the living types which the Catholic Church supplies, where is Anglicanism to find them? The Catholic artist can unfold the most noble characters or scenes of the past, by representing them as they would be found now in the Church. He would put St. Cuthbert or St. Thomas in cope and mitre such as may be seen on any high festival in the Church of Birmingham or Oscott; he would place an angel by his side in the alb and cincture which any minister could wear in a church of London or Bristol, and clothe the attendant

* Vita, p. 43.

monks in habits still worn at Downside or in Charnwood Forest. All would be new and yet fully represent the old, as nobly and as perfectly as it can be done. Let an Anglican artist try to establish the same links, and observe the same truthfulness; let him endeavour thus, through the eye, to convince Protestant beholders, that these venerable personages are fully represented by their modern counterparts. Will he venture to vest the Anglo-Saxon bishop in lawn sleeves and wig, or the angel in a chorister's surplice, or the monks in the cap and gown of an University Proctor, or Head of a House?

We might further add that Protestantism lacks essentially all religious tenderness and affectionateness. It has no sympathies with the mysteries that touch the feelings. The crucifix is, to it, what it was in St. Paul's time dividedly to Jew and Gentile, both a stumbling-block and foolishness; the Mother of sevenfold grief is a superstition. Meditation on the infancy or passion of our Lord are not part of youthful training in its schools; it has not produced a tender writer on these subjects.

Now from all this, what are we to conclude? Not merely that Protestantism will never give reality to Lord Lindsay's day-dreams, on the revival of christian art in England, not merely that it is effete in regard to all artistic purposes, but that Christian art is a noble and a divine existence not to be commanded by patronage, not to be bought by wealth, not to be coaxed by flattery, not even to be wooed and won by genius. It must spring up, either like the Phoenix from the ashes of its great predecessors, and this it may do in Italy, or like the first light, by creation from the void of a preceding chaos. Protestantism has neither a smouldering spark nor a creative vigour to quicken it. But the Catholic Church has it everywhere, and therefore here. And this is our answer to our former queries. The time is come; and Catholic art is even now ready to spring into life. We are sure, we know it as a certainty, that there are at this moment in England, artists of the highest name and character ready to lend the powerful guidance of their abilities and experience, towards directing the formation of such a school. We know too, that there are not wanting youthful artists ready to constitute its body under such guidance; men full of confidence, because full of faith; enamoured of all that the Church teaches them to love as

well as to believe; admirers of all that is truly beautiful in ancient art and in living virtue; trained already, and skilled in the mechanism and material portion of their art; and what is more important than all, enured to the exclusively Catholic principle of self-devotion, self-dedication to what is fair, good, and holy, for its own sake. Here is all ready, the materials are compounded, only the quickening touch is wanted, and all will burst into life. Let it not be thought that we are basing our conclusions on vague data or uncertain conjecture; that our wishes are the only groundwork for our assertions. We have carefully weighed the whole matter, we have within reach all that we have reckoned on, we have every evidence that can promise certain results before us, and we are sure that the Catholic public is but little aware of the number of religious artists existing in the country, of their talents, of their zeal, and of their earnest desire to create and perpetuate a school of genuine religious art. Let only what we have written produce an echo in the Catholic mind; let us feel that the ground is secure under our feet; let us learn that a practical effort to produce and to show forth all that we have promised will be generously seconded and supported, and we will engage that what we have written shall not be a dead letter, but shall mark the era of the rise, or at least the planting, of a flourishing and fruitful Institution.

We have till now had occasion to speak of Lord Lindsay's work, more in the way of reprehension than of praise. We should be sorry, however, to dismiss it thus. It is, without exception, the most elaborate, the most intelligent, and the most complete work on Christian art which English literature contains. Lord Lindsay has travelled through Italy with the eye of a connoisseur, and the admiration of an enthusiast. He has traced, as far as possible, by his works, the history of each great master, followed his influence through the various schools, and endeavoured to make out the filiations and connections of these. Any one travelling into Italy, for artistic purposes, will find this work not merely a useful, but an indispensable companion. Besides the more serious faults which regard religion, and are painful to a Catholic reader, it has many lesser blemishes and mistakes, which a second edition will probably correct. We have not made any regular note of these, but a few examples may serve to direct the author's eye to others.

Vol. i. p. 33, S. Stefano in Rotondo is described as an ancient Baptistery; of which there is no evidence; in fact, it was originally an open portico, perhaps a public hall. Page 78, the mosaic on the triumphal arch of the Basilica of St. Paul, near Rome, fortunately was not destroyed. It was taken down after the fire, and carefully repaired, to be again replaced. Page 86 (note), we are told that "of the intermediate Dedication" (Presentation) "of the Virgin (her ascent of the steps of the temple when a child) there certainly existed a traditional representation in the tenth and eleventh centuries, but it is very rare and of inferior merit, and was never, that I am aware of, copied by Italian artists." We are writing this almost at the foot of a painting, most probably by Giotto, representing this very subject. Page 89, the mosaic of our Lord's Baptism at Ravenna is said to be probably the original of the traditional representation of this subject. We can refer further back to the painting over an ancient font of living water in the Catacombs, out of the Porta Portese. Page 92 we have the two usual male figures, engaged in the Deposition from the Cross, described as "Joseph and Nathaniel." In vol. ii. p. 192, the same two persons are called "Nicodemus and Nathaniel." We need not observe that the second name in each enumeration is an error; and that Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea should stand together in both places. Page 159, St. Nicholas of Myra and St. Nicholas of Bari are made two distinct persons, uncle and nephew. But the great Archbishop of the East is the same whose body now reposes at Bari, from which he consequently has taken his name.

These, however, are small inaccuracies, compared with one which pervades the work: the German theorizing spirit in which the author attempts to explain the characteristics of different schools, or of different epochs of art, by the greater prevalence of ethnographical influences, the disproportionate intermixture of given races. This is useless as it is fanciful; and in reading a work where one naturally looks for information, for principles, and occasionally for eloquent description or bursts of feeling, one is only annoyed, and almost disgusted, to find the Hindoo, or the Medo-Persian, or the Teutonic element of art brought in to account for results which can have no connection with any of them. Nay, this is carried so far, that we are gravely told that, to understand the reason

why the Greek Church turned their churches towards the East, and the Roman towards the West, "we should recollect that Byzantine was a Dorian city, that Roman civilization was of Ionian origin, and that the Dorians and Ionians, the types respectively of conservation and progression, entered their temples, the former from the West, the latter from the East—the former bending their eye for ever on the world they had left behind, the latter pressing eagerly forward in search of novelty and change." (vol. i. p. 19.) Surely this is but solemn trifling at the best.

We will now draw our remarks to a conclusion. We believe Lord Lindsay's work calculated to do much good; to awake thought, and to excite good desires, on the subject of christian art. Many passages, too, there are in it which will gratify every Catholic, from the candid testimony which they bear to the privileges, if not to the truths, of his religion. We will conclude with one extract, which will show his opinion respecting the ecclesiological movement in the Anglican Church.

"I much fear that Mr. Pugin is right—that it is 'as utterly impossible to square a Catholic building with the present rites as to mingle oil with water,'—that 'those who think merely to build chancels without reviving the ancient faith, will be miserably deceived in their expectation,'—'the study of ancient church architecture' (in such an exclusive spirit) 'is an admirable preparation for the old faith,'—and that 'if the present revival of Catholic antiquity is suffered to proceed much farther, it will be seen that either the Common Prayer or the ancient models must be abandoned.'—*Ecclesiastical Antiquities*, pp. 130, 137, &c. But what is the alternative? the meeting-house? By no means. The Church of England is neither Catholic nor Protestant—she does not with the Catholics exalt Imagination and repudiate Reason, nor with the Protestants exalt Reason and repudiate Imagination, but includes them both, harmoniously opposed, within her constitution, so as to preserve the balance of truth, and point out the true 'via media' between Superstition on the one hand, and Scepticism on the other, thus approximating (in degree) to the Ideal of human nature, Christ Incarnate, of whom the Church is the Body, and ought to be the Likeness and the Image. This, then, is the problem—England wants a new architecture, expressive of the epoch, of her Anglican faith, and of the human mind as balanced in her development, as heir of the past and trustee for the future—a modification it may be, of the Gothic, but not otherwise so than as the Gothic was a modification of the Lombard, the Lombard of the Byzantine and Roman, the Byzantine and Roman of the Classic

Greek, the Classic Greek of the Egyptian. We have a right to expect this from the importance of the epoch, and I see no reason why the Man to create it, the Buschetto of the nineteenth century, may not be among us at this moment, although we know it not."—Vol. ii. p. 29, note.

What chance is there for christian painting in the Church which has not yet raised fitting walls on which it can be executed?

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

I.—*The Statesmen of America in 1846.* By SARAH MYTTON MAURY. London, Longmans, 1847.

A WORK on America from a lady, full of admiration and of enthusiasm, is certainly a rarity. We have been so long accustomed to read nothing but abuse of the United States as regards their social condition, and our political relations have been so clouded by an appearance of rivalry and by the danger of collision, that our views of that great commonwealth, whose future prospects are indeed a mystery, have not generally worn a friendly aspect. Mrs. Maury has visited them at the moment when such feelings, if mutual, as they might be naturally supposed to be, would engender suspicion of a stranger, closeness and reserve. Mrs. Maury however seems neither to have apprehended, nor to have encountered, any such result. She threw herself with confidence, on the generous feelings of the American people, or their leaders, and she seems to have met with the reverse of disappointment. Nor, we are sure, will her friends in the other hemisphere find reason, in her book, to repent of their civility or even kindness to her. It is returned not in the language of formal acknowledgment, not as it would be by a traveller of the "Nil admirari" school, who thinks that every attention is his due, and that his satire or his sting are cheaply bought off by the homage of his intended victims, but by a hearty, sincere, warm-hearted admiration of American men and American things, which seems to embrace all in

its universality and its intensity. One particular feature of this new feeling will certainly strike every reader. Each and every statesman, great or small, with whom Mrs. Maury makes acquaintance, is a *gentleman*, in the highest sense of the word; endued with refinement of mind and polish of manners, adorned with every courtly grace, fitted to shine in any sphere of society however brilliant or however exalted. The phrase may be varied, the praise may be modified; but were any one to read this, as his first book on America, he would come to the inevitable conclusion, that its Government and Senate are composed of a galaxy of elegant and highly finished courtiers, such as the *Salle des Maréchaux*, or the gardens of Versailles never collected together. We do not wish to challenge the truth of our lady-traveller's statements: perhaps she has excluded from her portrait gallery the many who were not worthy of her richly-carved frames; probably her own frank, and confiding, and warm address thawed and melted in every one that took her fancy, his republican coldness and official *hauteur*; certainly she is the person to have often seen others, in their image reflected on herself, rather than in their realities, as she would have great public characters to be, rather than as they truly are.

But be it as it may, we are not disposed to quarrel with one who looks at men and things with the milk of kindness, rather than in the gall of bitterness. Of the latter we have unhappily too much in this cynical age, of the former but little. And certainly there is one sketch, more of a full length portrait than any of the others, to the truth of which we can speak. There is indeed a dash of warmth thrown into the colouring, that belongs to the enthusiasm of character which we have imputed to the artist; but the features, the expression, the life, we will answer for as true. We allude to the memoir of the Right Rev. Dr. Hughes, Bishop of New York. What interests us, however, in this biography, is the frank and uncompromising avowal made by Mrs. Maury, of her opinions respecting religion in America. Every writer almost, on the subject, has borne testimony to the wonderful and steady progress of the Catholic Faith in that country, but Mrs. Maury goes further. She maintains its necessity for the United States, she considers it as the only safeguard, the sole hope, the exclusive chance of salvation from ruin, for the democracy

of the union. Our readers, we feel certain, will excuse our presenting them with a long extract on this subject.

"The Bishop is the greatest temporal Prince in America, and he is the greatest spiritual Prince in the world. And his reign is more immutable than that of Kings and Presidents, because it is not merely an earthly, but a heavenly bond that unites him to his flock; Kings rule by inheritance, and Presidents by election; but this man rules alone through the mighty influences of Religion. And marvellous are its effects, not only upon the people committed to his charge, but on those also whose religious and political prejudices have been and are arrayed against them. The discipline of the Catholic Church, fortified by experience, sanctioned by time, justified by its results, does even now exert its guardian influences upon the moral character of the American people. As education proceeds in its glorious mission, this long persecuted, much enduring faith, is gradually restored to its honours and to its privileges of usefulness.

"The dearest and warmest friends of the Republic look with fear and trembling on her sectional divisions, her party jealousies; upon the various and conflicting interests which are enclosed within her bosom; upon the strange and anomalous divisions, sub-divisions, and minor sub-divisions of her interminable and contending religious denominations; and with greater apprehension still upon the varieties of national character and feeling which are daily becoming more strongly marked in feature, and which require more urgently every hour some amalgamating influence of higher origin, of more harmonizing tendency than the civil or the legal code. The equality enjoyed, and the freedom exercised by every individual of the United States in the choice of their religion, moral views, commercial enterprises, habits, manners, and society, is their birth-right;—and were men angels, or still lived in the blessed ignorance of evil that was the lot of our first parents in Paradise;—then, indeed this freedom would be as heavenly in its effects as in its origin. But Man, Alas! is still apparelled in his coil of clay;—he is born in sin, and a child of wrath, and his very virtues themselves are embued with a taint of the earth from which his mortal body was compounded; his ardour becomes ambition, his hope grows into confidence, his repentance sinks into despair, his wisdom is folly, his liberty licentiousness; and since the commission of that pristine sin which "first brought death into the world, and all our woe," he who was created in the similitude of God, pursues his weary footsteps begirt with woe, deformed with vice, a frail and darkened image.

"The Gospel of Christ indeed sheds on us all its hallowed rays;—but the experience of all ages has shown that even the Gospel, the inspired word of God himself, must be moulded into a tangible form to be available in its effects on our degraded nature; that be-

lievers must practise certain preconcerted external modes of worship extracted from its promulgations, and must unite in one universally acknowledged Confession of Faith, in order to establish and perpetuate religious observances among men. The primitive Christians, guided by that light from Heaven, which like the Star in the East upon the path of the expectant Shepherds, shone upon their fond inquiries, elicited from the NEW TESTAMENT, the precious Legacy which they had received from Christ and his Apostles, those forms and habitudes of prayer which in after and happier years were ratified by the Fathers, and confirmed by the Councils of the Church.

“THESE ARE THE FORMS AND HABITUDES WHICH CONSTITUTE THE CREED AND WORSHIP; OR, IN OTHER WORDS, THE RITUAL OF THE CATHOLIC RELIGION.

“Modified in after ages by accidental causes, sometimes in honour, sometimes in dishonour, sometimes in wisdom, sometimes in folly, these forms have, notwithstanding, been the true, essential, and unchangeable canons on which all other denominations have reared their faith; and it is somewhat curious that the nearer these recusant denominations approach to the Roman Catholic ordinances, whether of Creed or form, the more exalted are the claims they put forth to Orthodoxy. But vain is the assumption, and false the claim; there is no stronger, more impregnable point in Orthodoxy, than UNITY—and it is precisely this Unity which is the brightest jewel in the diadem of the Catholic Church;—it is this Unity, in all her attributes, that has not only enabled her to be the mightiest, most extended, and most apostolic of Christian Communities, but it has carried her through centuries of sorrow with unrepining patience and submission. *Her ministers have endured the Cross, despising the shame*;—it is this Unity which creates the attachment of her disciples to her Faith;—her Priests teach as men having authority; they preach the Gospel assisted by the light of tradition; they study and they know; it is, moreover, her Unity, that quickening spirit which has at length enabled her to cast off her sackcloth and ashes, to put on the whole Armour of Light, and in a new hemisphere the gift of her disciples to the elder world, to arise in Glory and in Majesty;—universal, spiritual, and incorruptible.

“But of all the consequences which result from the UNITY of the Church, the most important, the most needful in the existing state of society, is the DISCIPLINE of the heart of man; the reduction of his nature to the laws of *Heaven* and of *Humanity*. It is of this Discipline and its Effects that I would briefly speak.

“I have alluded above to the apprehensions entertained by many of the best and wisest citizens of America with regard to the various intersectional causes which may estrange her people from each

other, springing, as they do, in countless multitudes from North, and South, and East, and West. The impending result is *alienation or disruption*. Where then is the Union? I have also remarked upon the privileges exercised alike in common by the young and by the aged, by the learned and by the ignorant, by the high and by the low; by the master and his servant, by the teacher and the pupil—by the parent and the child; equal terms exist between all these unequal relations of life; and the natural consequence is *insubordination*. Where then is prosperity; where is peace, or the rational liberty and protection of the citizen? And I have commented upon the extraordinary spectacle presented by the religious denominations in America, and the dramatic aspects they present in their zealous efforts, each to emblazon *majority* upon their banner. They are separated into invisible fractions. 'As a house divided against itself must fall,' so these various creeds must be extinguished by their own ambitious and restless aspirations. And the effect must be their gradual *extermination*. What then becomes of Religion?

"From these momentous causes the difficulties to be anticipated are many and manifest; they need not be enlarged upon.

"And where is the remedy? not in the Institutions of a Democracy; in them is the origin of the evil; not in parental authority, —the youth of America is impatient of restraint; not in self correction, —the masses any where rarely practise it; not in the mechanical instruction of the schools,—they o'er inform the *mind*, and leave the *spirit* in its ignorance; not in the abridgment of Liberty, either public or private—God forbid! — — — — —

And looking round in anxious and enquiring solicitude, for dear, unutterably dear to me is that America where my children's children will be reared, I behold, with grateful heart, provision made by the Supreme Regulator of human things against these ripening dangers; dangers which the mind dares scarcely pause to look upon. A scheme of infinite Mercy has been divulged and committed to the wisdom and energy of appointed Messengers to be fulfilled. THE CLERGY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH OF EUROPE, THE HEIRS OF THE FIRST PILGRIMS OF THE CROSS IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE, SEEK THEIR INHERITANCE; they rest their claims upon the Gospel which they preach, upon the services which they render, and the examples which they give; taking neither purse nor scrip across the ocean, they carry with them the inestimable boon which maketh men wise unto Salvation. They have laid the foundation stone of real education; education of the heart; the formation of character; *without which liberty is licentiousness*; and compared to which the mere accomplishments of the mind and fingers are airy nothings, unsubstantial in possession and useless in application. In the numerous and crowded Catholic Schools of the United States are taught the exercise of prayer, the practice of morality, the laws of obedience and responsibility; and self sacrifice and

moral and spiritual humility, and good works as well as *saving faith*, and charity, and brotherly love, and tolerance; and here the strong hand of DISCIPLINE is felt and respected. Many well judging persons of different religious persuasions have assured me that the only really *useful* and *corrective* education is that of the Catholic Schools and Colleges. So far as I have known, these Seminaries are crowded not only with pupils of their own Creed, but with those of all other Sects. And I have high official authority for saying that the Ministers and Missionaries of the Roman Catholic Church are at this moment doing more good for the cause of virtue and morality, throughout the whole continent of America, than those of any other religious denomination whatever.

"The Constitution provides that no religious sect shall be incorporated with the Government. This wise and wholesome prohibition can never be infringed;—every American heart would rebel, every American hand would be raised at so foul a usurpation. The Union of Church and State, unnatural in all governments, would be monstrous in a Republic, and must, of necessity, end in the corruption of both, and the destruction of one. In such an event, the weaker must yield to the stronger, the Church to the State, and any Church in America, by seeking aggrandizement in wealth or political power, would shortly and inevitably discover that it had drawn upon itself hopeless and endless ruin. It is the general opinion among the enlightened Catholic Clergy that the greatest trial the Church has ever endured has been its union with the State; and they regard its emancipation from such an alliance as the most certain assurance of its future rapid increase, and permanent establishment. Excess of wealth, excess of power, corrupt the Church as they do mundane Communities.

"But the professors of the Catholic Religion in America, are too wise, too well instructed in the history of past ages, and too observant of the present aspect of both hemispheres of the world, to be still ignorant that all forms of Religious Administration must be engrafted upon national character; that they must reflect the civil institutions of a country, *so far as the laws of God permit*, and not oppose or rival them—that their ministers must teach submission; not usurp power. And it is the most extraordinary feature of this wonderful Religion that it is adapted to all Governments, all nations, all periods, all climates, all characters; with their vicissitudes and their attributes. In Europe, both Monarchies and Republics have professed its Creed; and in America, the purest of Democracies is gradually recognizing its perfections.

"The Hierarchy of the Catholic Church in the United States seek not endowment; they love their independence; they seek not power; they prize their purity; they seek not sinecures; they value their high prerogative of usefulness. And thus as saintly men do they pursue their steady way, void of offence before God and Man, approved on earth, and registered in Heaven.

"I am an Episcopalian, or Protestant of the Church of England, by my profession of religious Faith—in this Creed was I born, in this Creed was I baptized, confirmed, and married; and in this Creed I hope to die; it is the prevailing worship of my country; for nineteen years I have knelt by my husband's side at the same Altar; its excellent and indefatigable Minister,* is our neighbour, friend, and relative; one by one our children have been presented at its sacred font; year by year our sympathies have strengthened, and our trust has been confirmed in its rites and promises; and I can suppose no circumstance to which its principles and its ceremonials may not to me be all sufficient. But I am not, cannot be blinded to the many excellencies of the Catholic Church; and especially as its Institutions regard America; they are, beyond comparison, the best adapted to curb the passions of a young, a fierce, impetuous, intelligent, generous and high minded Democracy;†—to protect the Religion of a Republic from annihilation; to subdue the struggling and discordant interests of an immense Territory into harmony, and to enchain the sympathies of a whole people in one magnificent scheme of morality and devotion. 'They shall be one fold under one Shepherd.'

"The Institutions besides, of this Church, are themselves based upon that very *equality* which their *discipline* so efficiently modifies. There is one common law, and one alone, for all—in the words of the Old Testament, so admirably adapted to the description of the Catholic Faith;—'Here the wicked cease from troubling; and here the weary are at rest; here the prisoners rest together; they hear not the voice of the oppressor. The small and great are there; and the servant is free from his master.' These words cannot be said to the same extent of any other Church whatever.

"The celibacy of the Catholic Clergy (a matter about which all this busy gossiping world concerns itself infinitely more than they do themselves,) is another great advantage in the wilds of this great continent, and in her populous cities. No domestic or personal anxieties distract or lead them from their flock; '*Dès qu'un Prêtre se marie, il n'est plus Prêtre?*'‡ observed the Marquis de Talaru, to me one day, upon the Mississippi. And I frequently experienced the truth of the remark.

"I yield this tribute of just and high commendation to the professors of this faith with pleasure mingled with pain; for I owe them much excuse;—I blush for my former weak and contemptible intolerance. I was reared in the vulgar prejudices of ignorance against Catholic teachers and their disciples: in England, I knew

* The Rev. John Tobin, of Liscard, in Cheshire.

† "And of that Democracy I am the proud adherent, the faithful advocate, and the devoted admirer."

‡ "As soon as a Priest marries, he is no longer a Priest."

them not;—sought them not;—loved them not; but among the many benefits derived from my visit to America, has been that one of exceeding value, the acquaintance and friendship of the excellent and enlightened Bishop of New York, who holds so high a place in his adopted country.”*—pp. 483—496.

II.—*A Manual of British and Irish History.* By the REV. THOMAS FLANAGAN, Professor at St. Mary's College, Oscott. 1 vol. royal 12mo. Published by Jones, Paternoster Row, London; and by Wrightson and Webb, New Street, Birmingham. 1847.

ANOTHER history of England! will perhaps be the exclamation of the reader, as he sees the announcement of the *Manual of British and Irish History*. If, however, he has been accustomed to the studies, and still more if he has been engaged in teaching in any place of Catholic education connected with the London University, he will hardly need to turn to the preface of the *Manual*, to be reminded that, notwithstanding the many histories that have already been written, something more was required; a history was wanting far shorter indeed than that of Lingard, yet at once sufficiently ample and sufficiently critical, to correspond with the enquiring spirit of the present day.

We are far from wishing to depreciate the histories that have been so long in the hands of Catholic youth; yet we think that these histories, however valuable as introductions for the young, are but imperfectly suited to the exigencies of the middle of the nineteenth century. Twenty or thirty years of close investigation into the sources of history has not passed in vain, indeed, has produced almost incredible results. It would then be astonishing, if

* “I had a favour to ask from him on the behalf of a friend, and called upon him, simply introducing myself as the friend of Dr. Lingard, the Historian of England. It was a matter of the highest gratification to me to find the name of this revered and gifted person as widely known, and his talents and character as highly appreciated in America as they are in England. I have described his person, way of life, and manners, to numerous readers and admirers of his Works throughout my travels; on the noble St. Lawrence, on the lovely Lake of the Hurons, on the beloved Mississippi, in Canada, throughout the United States, (even in Connecticut,) the Americans, with their free and independent habit of praising merit, all ascribe honour to Dr. Lingard.”

works published more than a quarter of a century ago, could be on a level with the present stage of historical knowledge.

It might, therefore, have been supposed, without recurring to the experience of our colleges, that some work, an intermediate step between Lingard and Mylius, was still wanting. Such a want, we trust, has at length been supplied; but upon this topic the limits of the present number forbid us to enter, a more extended notice must be deferred to a future article.

The Manual under review is so compressed, as to contain fully as much matter as three ordinary octavo volumes. Although it contains 970 pages of clear type, it is very far from being a ponderous book, the paper being of such a quality as to combine great thinness with toughness and durability. The work is enriched with fifty wood engravings, five copper-plate maps, and many useful tables. The engravings illustrate the arms, dress, and architecture of the respective periods. The maps represent the kingdoms of the Anglo-Saxons, with a view of the territories of the Danish or Scandinavian tribes; the French possessions that owned the sway of Henry II; the vast dominions of Britain in Indostan and America, and the British Isles. The tables are of three classes, statistical, genealogical, and chronological; the last serving, at the same time, as a general index.

The work is prefaced with a literary introduction, or an account of the chief sources of British and Irish history, and is "dedicated by permission" to Dr. Lingard. To these brief observations, we will only add that at the recent exhibition at St. Mary's College, Oscott, Dr. Wiseman gave the only copy of the Manual that was then completed, as a prize to one of the students, with the observation, that his only object in so doing, was to give a public testimony of his approbation of the work.

III.—*Manual for Confirmation.* By the Hon. Mrs. H. WELD. Richardson and Son: London, Dublin, and Derby.

A BOOK of this kind was wanted for Catholic children, to assist them in their preparation for confirmation; at least, we are not aware of any which exactly answered the purpose—a book which should be something more than a mere development of the elementary instruction which

they have already learned in the first catechism—which should be simple, and yet meditative and devout. The present work is very complete; it contains excellent short meditations upon the *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, thanksgivings, and reflections after confirmation, some good instruction, and abundance of suitable litanies and prayers.

IV.—*The Life and Times of the Roman Patrician Alexis, to which is annexed an account of the Mission founded in Kentish Town, by the Rev. Hardinge Ivers; and a notice of the late disgraceful attempt at Religious Persecution. Inscribed to Pius IX., the Hon. G. S. Smythe, and the New Generation.* By MILES GERALD KEON. Thomas Richardson and Son, London, Dublin, and Derby.

WE have given the title page at full length, for there is something stilted and flashy about it, entirely characteristic of the book. This “brilliant effusion from the eloquent pen of Mr. Keon,” (to borrow the words of the Rev. Mr. Ivers,) is divided into two parts; the first fifty pages are devoted to the “Times” and to the “Life and Death of the Patrician,” or in other words of St. Alexis. They ought to contain a world of learning, for a list is given of thirty-one erudite works which have been consulted in their composition; we certainly looked only at the result, which is a dashing sort of narrative, written with much spirit, and in a style rather too romantic for the subject. We have next a glowing eulogy on the Rev. Mr. Ivers, and an account of the establishment and prosperity of the Mission of St. Alexis in Kentish Town, every word of which will be gratifying to Catholic readers; and with which the book might well have concluded, for we cannot think that the “persecutions” justify the heat and vehemence with which they are recorded. The only distinct act we can find out, is that some charge having been brought against Mr. Ivers, a warrant was obtained against him at so late an hour, that he could not find bail, and he consequently spent the night in confinement. This was unquestionably an act of great, but probably of private, malevolence.

The next thing which excites Mr. Keon’s indignation is, that the Protestant clergyman denied that the Blessed Sacrament had been carried in procession, and with lights; he was clearly wrong, and ought to have been better informed before venturing the contradiction: but there

was not, we think, any great harm done. The great grievance of all, however, is one to which many a clergyman has been subjected, and which arose from Catholics, some of whom were "mean enough to hint" that the new Mission might injure those of Somer's Town and Hampstead. Our author's denunciations upon this became so furious, that he found it expedient to explain that the charge did not apply to the clergy of those Missions, and to fix it at last upon those unhappy scapegoats of society, a "circle of old women." Poor old ladies! we should think they must have been far more alarmed than alarming. These, so far as we can make out, have been "the last efforts at religious persecution which the nineteenth century, we trust, will ever witness." (p. 84.) We trust they may be the most mischievous, and shall in that case consider the nineteenth century exceedingly well off.

V.—*Language, in Relation to Commerce, Missions, and Government; England's Ascendency and the World's Destiny.* By EIS ECLECTIKWN. Manchester, Burgess and Co., 1846.

THIS little tract is a spirited and eloquent recommendation to "Merchants, Statesmen, and Philanthropists," to use their ascendancy to make the English the "common language" of our dependencies, and eventually the universal vehicle of thought, "wherever free trade and Christianity prevail;" if this latter part of the project should be considered as Utopian, we at least fully concur in the author's views respecting our own dependencies, India especially, and see the full advantages (which he has put forward very forcibly,) of elevating the minds of our Indian subjects, and securing their sympathy with us and their concurrence in our rule, by teaching them our language, and through it, opening to them all the treasures we possess of learning and civilization. Success then to the Anglo-Hindoo College at Calcutta, "in which it is sought to impart an English education of a high description;" may such institutions be multiplied, especially if it should appear that the English language is indeed the best means of introducing Christianity; that it will serve most effectually to break down the prejudices of Hindooism there can be little doubt. "The editor of the Enquirer," a native paper in Bengal, who was once a Brahmin, is now a Christian, and received his English education at the

Hindoo College, has put on record his testimony in the clearest terms.

"The Hindoo College, under the patronage of Government, has, as indeed it *must* have, destroyed many a native's belief in Hindooism. How could a boy continue to worship the Sun, when he understood that this luminary was not a divinity, (devatah,) but a mass of inanimate matter? How could he believe in the injunctions of such masters as taught him lessons contrary to the principles inculcated by his lecturer in natural philosophy? The consequence was that Hindooism was battered down. No missionary ever taught *us*, for instance, to forsake the religion of our Fathers. It was Government that did us this service."

Another newspaper, the "Reformer," edited also by a native, speaks of the Hindoo College in the following strain:

"Has it not been the fountain of a new race of men amongst us? From that institution, as from the rock from whence the mighty Ganges takes its rise, a nation is flowing in upon this desert country, to replenish its withered fields with the living waters of knowledge."—p. 20.

We can add nothing to this, except the prayer that beside these "waters of knowledge," may grow the divine "Tree of Life."

VI.—*Louisa, or the Virtuous Villager*. A Catholic Tale. Translated from the French for the use of Catholic Schools. Richardson and Son: London, Dublin, and Derby.

THIS is a reprint of a little work which has long been appreciated by the Catholic public. We are glad to have an opportunity of making it still better known, for it is a useful and amusing addition to the library of young people; indeed, at any age it may be read with edification. If we were to find any fault, it would be in a certain hard and stern tone of morality, bordering upon what we have heard described as "Puritanical Catholicism," and which we certainly object to. It may be said, that it is not easy to draw a line, and that this is a fault on the right side; but we cannot be sure of that,—the conscience of the young is like the rest of their organization; it may be *too* heavily pressed upon, *too* constantly called into exertion; and the mischief is great indeed where this is the case. We are, however, rather intending a general

reflection than any grave censure upon the book, which contains a great deal of incident and a great deal of excellent instruction. Louisa escapes (not altogether unscathed) from the temptations of dances, visits to the patron saint, and other dangers, and leads an exemplary life through all the difficulties and trials of a laborious villager's life.

VII.—*The Twelve Virtues of a Good Master.* From the French of M. DE LA SALLE, Institutor of the Brothers of the Christian Schools, and M. AGATHON, Superior General of the same Order. By FRANCIS M. FETHERSTON, Esq. Richardson and Son: London, Dublin, and Derby.

GRAVITY, Silence, Humility, Prudence, Wisdom, Patience, Discretion, Meekness, Zeal, Vigilance, Piety, Generosity: these—no less than these—are the virtues of a Good Master, the qualifications necessary for every man who undertakes to educate children; more especially the children of the poor, whom he must reclaim from vice and ignorance—whose intellect he must open to future information—whose hearts he must (with reverence be it spoken) prepare and cultivate for the fructification of divine grace. Such at least is the opinion of the blessed M. de la Salle, and of the Superior General of his inestimable Order. It is an awful consideration; true it is, that there are many who have been formed in this school, those holy men whom we now and then turn to look after with reverence as they move beside immense processions of young boys, obedient to a look, a word, the slightest gesture of these venerable masters. But what contrasts to these men may be found amongst Catholic schoolmasters! how great is the responsibility of many of these men, and of those by whom they are appointed! We could wish that this little work were in every one's hands; it must open new views of education to many; all might obtain valuable hints upon the subject, and a sense of the great qualities necessary to form a good schoolmaster, and of his inestimable value when found.

VIII.—*Moral and Religious Epistles.* By the REV. JAMES WILLS, A. M. &c. &c. Dublin, Curry, 1846.

FOR a book of poetry, it would not be easy to devise a less attractive title than the above;—it would seem to con-

vey a certain promise of dulness, prosiness, and mediocrity. But, if the reader be not easily daunted by a title, he will find his courage or curiosity amply repaid by the perusal of Mr. Wills's volume. It is perfectly free from what we are in the habit of considering the dulness inseparable from a "Moral and Religious Essay;" and it will go far to redeem the "Poetical Epistle" from its hereditary character for vapidness and inanity. Indeed, though the versification in a few instances is careless and irregular, it contains more of genuine poetry, and what is now-a-days more rare, of profoundly religious poetical feeling, than would reconcile us even to a far more uninteresting form than that in which it is conveyed.

The Epistles, as we learn from the preface, were prepared for the press, and indeed were actually in type, at the time of the publication of Mr. Wills's former volume, already noticed in this journal; but, by the advice of his publisher, he deferred their publication till the present time, and he has added to them several shorter lyrical pieces, which, however, are likewise of a purely religious character. The Epistles are four in number. The first, though not the longest, is in many respects the most interesting. The subject, "The Contemplation of the Heavens," is one which affords full scope for the writer's fancy as well as for his loftier powers; and although the lines directly addressed to his correspondent are somewhat common-place, it contains passages which we have seldom seen surpassed for sublimity and power.

The limits of a notice like the present, preclude the possibility of doing justice to this interesting poem, by any extracts which would adequately represent it. It will be more satisfactory, therefore, to select one of the shorter odes, several of which are extremely beautiful. We choose, almost at random, the following paraphrase of the 136th, (in the authorised version 137th) Psalm.

"By Babel's rueful stream we sat,
And wept, remembering thee,
O Sion! in our fallen estate,—
Our sad captivity.
Where the pale osiers edged the deep,
Our harps hung mutely bound;
No tuneful murmur broke the sleep
Of all their sacred sound.

"The oppressor came, and bade us break
The silence sad and still ;
They asked for mirth, and bade us wake
The songs of Sion's hill.
Sternly we heard the proud command—
O could we sing for them
The Lord's song in a distant land
From thee, Jerusalem !

"Jerusalem ! not yet, not yet
Art thou forgotten so ;
Its cunning may my hand forget
Ere I thy love forego.
Yet but a moment—in his wrath
The Lord averts his look ;
But still our woes and tears he hath
All numbered in his book.

"Sleep, harp of Sion !—sleep in power,
Until thy waking tell
The dawn of retribution's hour—
The day of Israel.
As shades o'er you, swift waters, go,
Our clouds are flitting o'er ;
And song from Sion's hill shall flow
When Babylon is no more !"—pp. 103-4.

We hardly thought it possible to throw the charm of novelty over this beautiful yet hackneyed and familiar subject ; but we think Mr. Wills's paraphrase will bear comparison with any of those who have dealt with the subject before him.

The lines "On the Death of an Infant," though in a different strain, are yet exceedingly tender and beautiful ; and we regret extremely that it is not in our power to transcribe this, and a kindred piece entitled "Emblems." We must content ourselves with a general commendation of the volume. For those who have read his "Dramatic Sketches," the recommendation will hardly be necessary.

IX.—*Chemistry of the Four Seasons, Spring, Summer, Autumn, and Winter. An Essay.* By THOMAS GRIFFITHS, Professor of Chemistry in the Medical College of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, &c. 8vo. London, Churchill, 1846.

THE researches of recent experimentalists in animal and vegetable chemistry, though the data which they supply

are still far from being complete and satisfactory, yet have led to very important practical results. The discoveries in physiology and in agricultural science to which they have opened the way, have already introduced many a useful revolution in both departments; and in order to perfect what has been begun, it only remains for practical men to extend and apply the principles according to the various circumstances which may arise.

The volume now before us, however, is not of a practical character. It is a popular explanation, by the application of the science of chemistry, of the simple though seemingly mysterious operations, by which nature produces the phenomena of the several seasons—the germination and development of plants, the formation of flowers and seeds, the chemical changes by which these operations are affected, the principles which are brought into action, heat, electricity, moisture, &c., and the principles, special as well as general, by which their action is regulated. It is needless to say a word upon the engrossing interest of such a subject; indeed, we know no more attractive course of popular study, than the application of these principles to the every-day operations of nature. We are already in possession of several most interesting and valuable books upon the natural history and phenomena of the seasons, among which we would specially name Duncan's delightful volumes on the "*Sacred Philosophy of the Seasons*." But none of these had taken the precise line which Mr. Griffiths has chosen; and in a subject so large, it is hardly necessary to say, that a subdivision of matter will tend greatly to facilitate and improve the study.

Of the manner in which the author has executed his task, we cannot speak too highly. His essay is simple, orderly, accurate, and solid; while the style is so familiar, and the expositions so popular and so lucid, that even the youngest and least practical student will have no difficulty in following him even through his most complex explanations.

We should add, that the work is illustrated by numerous experiments; and in all cases, the directions for the preparation, manipulation, &c., are so plain and simple, that the merest tyro will be able to reduce them securely and successfully to practice.

X.—1. *Tales for the Young.* By HANS CHRISTIAN ANDERSEN. London, Burns, 1847.

2.—*Nursery Rhymes, Tales, and Jingles.* London, Burns, 1847.

IF the young generation of the present day do not grow up superior in wisdom, knowledge, refinement, and intelligence, we shall lose our faith in the perfectibility of the human race. At all events, if they fail to realize this expectation, the blame of the failure must not lie with those who have purveyed so liberally, and indeed so prodigally, for their improvement.

Among the friends of the young reader, we know none to whom a greater debt of gratitude is due, than Mr. Burns, the publisher of the beautiful little volumes before us. He is not only one of those far-seeing and enterprising men, who have discovered that literature, like every other material of commerce, must be made accessible to the multitude, if the producer would hope to realize the best profit from its production; but he deserves the still higher praise of having lent all his energies for the diffusion of literature, for the sake of literature itself. Labouring in the same great cause to which the Messrs. Chambers, Mr. Charles Knight, and other kindred spirits in "the trade" have devoted their lives, he has chosen for himself a peculiar department in which he laboured, the first, and indeed for a time almost alone. We need hardly name "The Fireside Library," "The Home Library," "The Cabinet Library for Youth," &c. &c., in order to justify all and much more than we have said; and yet these are but the most recent fruits of a zeal and energy which had for years been directed in the same track, at a time when cheap literature was thought of only to be ridiculed as a fond and foolish dream.

In expressing thus sincerely our sense of the merit due to this enterprising, and we believe, most successful publisher, we must not be understood, of course, to convey an unqualified approval of all that he has published, or even of all that is contained in the different series enumerated above. On the contrary, there are some of the volumes of the "Fireside Library," which in a literary point of view, are unworthy of a place in a series, the merit of which, generally speaking, is so high; but the number of these is small in comparison with the excellent and most interesting

volumes which are comprised in the collection; and even those which are thus deficient, (being, in almost every instance, translations from a foreign language,) are at least useful as specimens of the literature to which they belong.

The volumes before us will need no lengthened criticism. If beautiful typography and exquisite illustrations can make reading interesting and attractive to youth, these little books cannot fail to find readers in abundance. The tales of the well-known Danish writer Andersen, are just of that class of imaginative writings, which stimulate at once the wonder, the affections, and the understanding of the youthful reader. We shall best commend them to notice by transcribing one of the tales, the first in order. It is entitled "The Buckwheat."

"Often, in passing by a field of buckwheat after a thunder-storm, we see it all look black and drooping; we might almost think a flame of fire had swept over it; and it is then that the farmer is used to say: 'Ah, the lightning has done all that to it!'

"'But why has the lightning done all this?' will be asked perhaps by some solitary traveller, who seeks for a natural cause, or, at least, a simple reason for all that nature does. I will now tell you what the house-sparrow told me about it. The house-sparrow had it from an old willow-tree that once stood, and indeed is now standing, close by just such a field of buck-wheat. It is a large, grave willow-tree, gnarled, and rich in years, that seems to have burst in the middle, and from whose gaping clefts grow the grass and the bramble, and seem quite at home there. Its trunk bends over very much, as if it wanted a prop; and its branches hang down to the ground like long green hair.

"Over all the fields about grew beautiful grain—rye, and barley, and oats: yes, the pretty oats, which, when they are quite ripe, look just like a flight of little canary-birds on a bough. The growth of the corn had been blessed; and the heavier it was, the more humbly the good plant bowed its lowly head.

"But there was a field of buck-wheat too, and this field stretched itself out on one side till it reached the old willow-tree. The buck-wheat did not bow its head at all like the other kinds of corn, but towered up in the air as proudly and stiffly as it could.

"'I am as rich as the greatest of these,' it said, 'and much prettier too; my flowers are as beautiful as the rosy-apple blossom, and a delightful treat it is to look at me and my companions. Do you know of anything more beautiful, more noble, or, in short, any thing that can vie with us, you old, dreamy willow-tree?'

"And the mouldering stem nodded its mossy head, as if to say, 'Oh, yes, indeed, that I do!' But the buck-wheat tossed up its

head in pure disdain, and said: "The foolish tree! he is so old, that grass and weeds are creeping out of his body."

"In the meanwhile a very heavy storm came on. All the flowers of the field folded their leaves together, or modestly bowed their tender little heads to the ground, whilst the wind whistled over them. The buck-wheat was the only one that stood saucily erect in its pride.

" 'Bend down as we do,' whispered the other kind flowers.

" 'What need have I to do that?' said the buck-wheat, who would not easily be taught.

" 'Bend down as we do,' cried the corn; 'the angel of the storm is coming; he has wings that reach from the highest cloud to the bottom of the lowliest vale, and he will dash you down before you can ask him to have pity on you.'

" 'Once for all, I will not make so little of myself,' answered the buck-wheat.

" 'Shut up your flowers, and draw in your leaves,' said the cautious old willow-tree. 'Look not up at the lightning when the cloud opens; even man dare not do so; for when it lightens, they can see quite into heaven, though the light strikes them blind. What, then, would not befall us, herbs of the field, if we, in our littleness, dared to do so?'

" 'In our littleness!' echoed the buck-wheat, mockingly. 'No, indeed! I will look straight through into heaven.'

"And he did so in his guilty pride. It lightened so brightly that the whole world seemed to be in flames. As soon as the storm had raged its last, the flowers and the corn were seen standing in the still, pure air, refreshed by the rain, and happy as the spring. But the buck-wheat—the poor buck-wheat!—had been burnt black as a coal in the lightning. It was nothing more now than dead, useless weed of the field.

"And the old willow waved his branches in the wind, and large drops of water fell from the green leaves as if the tree were weeping. And the sparrows said: 'Why do you weep? It is so beautiful here. Look how the sun is shining, and the clouds sailing along. Do you not breathe the sweet scent of the flowers and the bushes? Why do you weep, then, you old willow-tree?'

"And the willow-tree told of the pride and the haughtiness of the buck-wheat, and of the punishment which, sooner or later, always follows upon crimes. I, who now tell this story over again, had it from the chattering sparrows. They twittered it to me one evening when I asked them for some pretty tale."—pp. 1-5

If all "children's tales" were as this one, we would gladly remain children all our lives.

- XI.—1. *Confraternity of the Immaculate Heart of Mary for the Conversion of Sinners.* Richardson and Son: London, Dublin, and Derby.
- 2.—*Little Office in honour of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary; to which is annexed the Devotion of the Six Sundays to St. Aloysius.* A new edition, revised and corrected by the Reverend THOMAS GRIMLEY. Richardson and Son: London, Dublin, and Derby.
- 3.—*A Novena for the Holy Season of Advent, by way of preparation for the Nativity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; consisting of Prophecies, Anthems, &c., gathered from the Roman Missal and Breviary, set to Gregorian Chants, with an English Translation.* Richardson and Son: London, Dublin, and Derby.

THE first of these little works contains a short account of the institution of the "Confraternity of the Immaculate Heart of Mary," its rules, and the forms of admission. If we may judge by what we have known ourselves of the great irregularity with which English Catholics take up and lay down these devotions at their pleasure, losing thereby all notion of a *Society*, we should think it would be useful.

The two others are excellent devotions to our Blessed Lady. It is a very good idea to make the prayers and offices of the Breviary more accessible by giving them in this popular form, and with translations; and we think it would have been more completely followed out, if the Gregorian chants could have been rendered into modern music, that all might have joined in singing those glorious anthems, "O Sapientia," "O Adonai," and the rest; the mere indications of which in our Directories we welcome with joy, and dwell upon as if the very sound of the words conveyed poetry. The hymns in the little office are well chosen and translated, but we cannot altogether like the litany of the immaculate conception; the titles addressed to our Blessed Lady, of "Strength of Martyrs," "Virtue of Confessors," "Purity of Virgins," "Sanctity of all Christians," are displeasing to us; we would not controvert the point, being well aware not only that they *must* be, and *are* intended in a proper sense, but how with a little ingenuity this might be made apparent. Still they might prove a stumbling-block even to those reasonable and liberal minded objectors who ought not to be scandalized, and we think there are even Catholics who will

agree with us that the words create a confusion of ideas which is unpleasant.

XII.—*The Virtuous Scholar, or Edifying Life of a Student.* Translated from the French. Richardson and Son : London, Dublin, and Derby.

WE most heartily recommend to all schools and to all young persons the life of this youthful saint ; who was the delight and glory of his college during his short life, and died at sixteen. Nothing can be sweeter than the fervour of his youthful piety ; but it was so simple, so well directed, and so applicable to his state of life, that the most cautious parent might recommend his life for imitation to their children without any qualification. The list of "Good Resolutions," which young Decalogne drew up for himself after his first communion, are excellently practical, as well as pious, being the result of the boy's own experience and sense of what conduced to his improvement ; and, with the comments made upon them by his director, cannot fail to be useful to many young minds aspiring to walk in the same happy path.

XIII.—*Address to the Friends of the Cross.* Translated from the French of the Venerable Servant of God, LEWIS MARY GRIGNON DE MONTFORT. Richardson and Son : London, Dublin, and Derby.

THE original of this "Address" appears to have been a sermon ; at least it has all the characteristics of French pulpit eloquence, being, in fact, a vehement and impassioned harangue, an urgent exhortation to obey the words of Christ, and "take up the cross." It is needless to say that the matter is excellent, but this style of eloquence requires the fervour of delivery to give it full effect even with its greatest admirers. When read—and read in the form of a translation—it is apt to fail in making a due impression.

INDEX TO VOLUME TWENTY-TWO.

- Academies of France*, 225.
Aidan St., emancipates slaves, 95—his charity, 97.
Allies Mr., his controversial work, 271, 273, 281, 288—his sense of his own inconsistencies, 296—his admission respecting the Pope, 303—his charges against De Maistre, 305—difficulties about the Greek Church, 310.
Architecture, its tendency to return to given models, 490.
Aristocracy, Irish, 130.
Art religious, manifestations of a desire for its improvement, 488—more knowledge on the subject, 488—its characteristics in religious pictures, 489—mistake to return in painting and sculpture to the art of the middle ages, 491—on what principles it should now proceed, 493—where it may find models, 494—its true principles must be learnt by meditation and holiness, 495—must be creative, 498—adopting modes of expression more suited to the present time, 499—instances, 500.
Artists Christian, of the middle ages, 495—painted for the people, 498.
Auerbach, his tales, 357—extracts from, 359.
Augustine St., 346.
Bellarmino Cardinal, concerning jurisdiction, 298—that of the apostles, 298—concerning tradition, 336—words attributed to him, 449.
Bishops, extent of their power, 291, 297—examples from the Fathers, 295.
Black Forest, its villages, 358.
Blood, Physiology of, 28—its composition, 27—organic substances of, 32—corpuscles, 34—their function, 36—other constituents of blood, 37—change produced in it by respiration, 38—coagulation of, 46—serum, 49—causes of its separation into "blood and water" at our Saviour's death, 50—mystery of its effusion, 53—had escaped from its vessels 54—into the pericardium, by breaking of the heart, 55.
Books, Notices of, 260, 515.
Bosquet, 204, 351.
Bridget, St., passage from her revelations, 59.
Brougham, Lord, his work on D'Alembert, 190—errors, 201, 203, 211, 214—attempts to justify D'Alembert's infidelity, 220—general character of his work, 227.
Brownson, Mr., 327—his arguments, 350.
Calas, his trial, 221.
Calculation, necessity for, 75—progress made in, 75—wonderful power of calculation occasionally found, 76—deficiencies in the power, 77—mechanical helps to calculation, 78.
Candyba, ruins of, 175.
Canus Melchior, 337.
Capranica, Cardinal, his opinion of church music, 144.
Catherine of Russia, her remark on the philosophers, 202.
Catholics, their rule of faith, 277—their sufferings in Ireland, 423.
Catholic art ready to spring to life, 511.
Catholicism strength of its historical evidence, 280—its increase in Ireland in spite of obstacles, 422.
Chapel of the Convent of Mercy, 22.
Chapters, German, 199.
Chastity, mistaken notions of the Catholic doctrine of, 509.
Christian Art, evidence of a taste for, among the people, 505, 506—not to be found in any Protestant country, 507.
Church, Catholic, in the time of the early Christians, 282—the same government continued in her to the present day, 284—her Catholicity, 311—scandals existing in her, 313—her foundation, 463—progress, 465—her piety and discipline prior to the writing of the Scriptures, 466—mutual correspondence between her teaching and that of Scripture, 479.
 —Anglican, failure in unity and Catholicism, 286—inconsistent position in this respect, 393—in Ireland, 419.
Christ unrecognized by the multitudes, 42—circumstances of His death, 49—flow of blood and water accounted for, 50—His sufferings, 51—opening in his side, 54—His heart broken by intense agony, 56—representations of Him, 492.
Comet, Halley's, 195.
Conception, immaculate, doctrine of, 334.

Controversies, internal Catholic, their nature, 135—contrasted with those of the Anglicans, 135.

Controversy, works upon, 271.

Convent of Sisters of Mercy, description of, 1—its establishment, 10—receives religious rules, 14—works of mercy therein carried on, 16—in receiving servants, 17—educating children, 18.

Converts, their advantages and otherwise, 138.

Costume, as applied to sculpture, &c., 501.

D'Alembert, his birth and parentage, 198—provision made for him by his parents, 201—studies, 201—adulation of Catherine, 202—his works, 203, 207, 210, 212—is admitted into the French Academy, 209—procures the admission of Abbe Millot, 209—promotes the infidel conspiracy, 210—is forbidden by her daughter to visit Madame de Geoffrin, 211—endeavours to prevent death-bed repentance, 211—his "Eloges," 217—his connection with Mademoiselle L'Espinasse, 218—his intolerance, 221—regard entertained for him by his friends, 223—his last moments, 223—death, &c., 226.

Desmond, Earls of, 133.

Development, doctrine of, 307, 337—instances, 334—Melchior Canus, concerning, 337—Suarez, extract from, 341—Möhler, 345—Döllinger, 345—St. Augustine, 346—St. Vincentius Lirinensis, 347—the infallibility of the Church a safeguard in this doctrine, 348—Cardinal Fisher's opinion, 349—the doctrine no novelty, 353.

Doctrine of the supremacy of Rome, its difficulties chiefly historical, 276—its necessity for the preservation of unity, 290—developments of doctrine, 307.

Education, scriptural, discouraged in Ireland, 415.

Elizabeth, Queen, motives of her conquest of Ireland, 127.

Emigration, importance of, to Great Britain, 394—duty of Government to interfere in it, 394—proofs of indifference, 395—miserable failures in attempts at Colonization, 395—should be attempted on a larger scale, 398—fluctuations in emigration, 399—causes of this fluctuation, 400—Lord John Russell's opinions concerning, 401—report of a committee upon, in 1827, 403—the North American Colonies recommended for emigration, 406.

Espinasse, Mademoiselle L'. 218.

Exchanges, arbitration of, 86.

Fathers of the Church, study of the, 280.

Fellows, Sir Charles, 159.

Fiesoli, Angelico da, his saintly character, 495.

Fish, in the Syrian Seas, 188.

Fisher, Cardinal, 349.

Fontanes, M. de, 224.

Fontenelle, 224.

Formby, Mr. 133-140—his work on Christian Psalmody, 142—strength of his prejudices, 148—enumeration of the ways by which a Christian may increase his love of psalmody, 157.

French, Nicholas, Bishop of Ferns, 127—his defence of Irish loyalty, 128.

Goodwyn, Mr., his extraordinary computations, 81.

Great Britain, secret of her greatness, 389.

Hafferman, William, his poems, 330.

Herbert, his picture of our Saviour at Nazareth, 504.

Histories of England, Dr. Lingard's, 93—Hume's 93—McCabe's 93.

History, its difficulties, 277—Church history no exception, 277—its value as a science, 278.

Inscriptions, Lycian, 161, 174, 181.

Ireland, measures of relief adopted for her since the potato disease, 232—by Sir Robert Peel, 232—by the Whigs, 236—what is the cause of her present condition, 258—how far England is responsible, 259.

Irish, the Catholic, 424.

James II, plots against him, 435, 441—his popularity in Scotland, 441—was ignorant of the barbarities of Jeffreys, 445—his illness on the breaking out of the revolution, 447.

Jesuits, sheltered by Frederic and Catherine, 213—Pascal's attack upon them, 213—great men produced by the Order, 215, and great deeds, 215—missions, 216.

Jurisdiction, distinction between it and order, 298.

Keller and his school of engravers, 489.

La Barre, his condemnation, 221.

Lagrange, anecdote of, 193.

Leinardi, 305.

Landlords, Irish, 100, 119, 130, 246, 258, 405.

Language, Irish, 324.

Lewis, Mr., his controversial work, 273-285,

315.

Life, 45, 52.

Lirinensis, St. Vincentius, 347.

Literature, Irish, attention now given to it, 318.

Logarithms, 86—will be of greater service when we have decimal coinage, 86—their use speedily appreciated, 88—their advantages compared with the tables which preceded them, 89.

Lord Lindsay's work, merits of, 512—mistakes of 513—the German theorizing spirit of, 513 his opinion of the ecclesiological movement, 514.

Lucan, Earl of, his atrocious conduct, 120.

Lycia, its antiquities, 159—persons who have explored them, 159—recent discoveries, 160—inscriptions, 161, 174—race to which they are to be ascribed, 161, 167, 184—rock-tombs, 165—language, 182—anecdotes of the people, 184—christian antiquities, 186—fish, 188.

McCabe, his History of England, entirely Catholic, 94—a history of the poor, 95—his text made up from the ancient writers, 96, 105—goodness of his notes, 106—probable length of the work, 108—its plan and aim, 109—extract from, 111—miracles recorded, 113.

Mac Namara, Donagh Roe, his poem, 321.

McAuley, Mrs. Catherine, her life, 2—resolves on becoming a Catholic, 6—takes a house as a charitable institution, 8—takes up her abode in it, 10—her difficulties, 10—her profession, 15—her death, 23.

Maistre, M. de, 305.

Malesherbes, his letter to D'Alembert, 222.

Marbles, Xanthian, 159.

Mary of Modena, 428—her objection to marriage, 429—her innocent life, 432—charges against her, 434—her exile, 448.

Mathematics, 191—instances of the power they give of abstracting the mind, 191—whether they produce a calm and even temper, 191.

- Mathematicians*, their dissensions, 194—their eminence, 196.
- Mercy*, Sister of, her duties, 19.
- Mercy*, Sisters of, sent by the Archbishop of Dublin to the Cholera Hospitals, 21.
- Miracles*, 113.
- Morris*, Rev. J. B. his translation of the Rhythms of St. Ephraim, 501.
- Motherwell*, William, 59—his life, 61—publications, 63—falls in giving evidence before the Committee of Enquiry of the Orange Society, 65—his death, 66—poems, 67.
- Music* of the Church, abuses in it in England, 137—figured music, 142—plain song the composition of Saints, 147.
- Mythology*, old christian art mistaken for, 508.
- Numbers*, integer, show extraordinary and mysterious results, 83.
- Novelists*, German, improvement in their taste, 355.
- O'Brien*, Dr., his illiberality, 409—his view of the state of theology in Ireland, 412—his opinion of foreign missions, 418—accuses the development of popery in Ireland, 422.
- O'Daly*, Dominic, his history of the Geraldines, 125—mention of Queen Elizabeth, 125—admiration of the nobles of Strongbow's train, 126.
- Order* of our Blessed Lady of Mercy institute d 14—its progress, and the good effects produced, 16—sanctioned by the Holy See, 23.
- Palestrina*, 145, 153.
- Papers*, its scarcity and bad quality inconveniencing former calculators, 83.
- Pascal*, his education, 215.
- Perspiration*, 40.
- Pinars*, ruins of, in Lycia, 163.
- Plain* chant, 151—desirable to reintroduce it, 154—requisites for its due performance, 155—easily obtainable, 156.
- Poor* law, Irish, 100, 117—necessary wherever Protestantism exists, 244—their absolute justice in Ireland, 245—should be made efficient, 248—how it could be borne, 249—promotion of fisheries, 250—cultivation of waste lands, 251—encouragement of railroads, 254—expense of such measures to England, 257.
- Pope*, the centre of unity, 300—his infallibility, 302—his sense of his own responsibility, 303—Gallican rebellion against him, 308—by Don Joseph, 309—exercise of authority, 310.
- Population*, statistics of, 308.
- Protestantism*, unholy as regards art, 509—the destroyer of the types of the past, 510.
- Protestants*, D'Alembert's prediction verified, that they would fall into Deism, 308.
- Purgatory*, belief in, 349.
- Renouf*, Mr., his controversial work, 272.
- Review*, Dublin, endeavour in its pages to excite attention to Christian art, 486.
- Rhetoric*, George Joachim, 84.
- Rule*, Sliding, method of using it, 79.
- Russell*, Lord John, his opinions on Emigration, 402.
- Sacrament*, the Blessed, light before it in the chapel of the convent of Mercy, 22.
- Scripture*, the Anglican rule of faith, 457—defects of this rule, 458—use made of it by the designing, 458—abused by heretics, 460—and infidels, 461—should be interpreted always by the teaching of the Church, 462—purpose of the Epistles, 468—and other portions of scripture, 459—internal evidence that they were not intended to bring men into the Church, 470—what class of truths are illustrated by them, 477—how their testimony is filled up by the Church, 479.
- Servants*, home for them in the House of Mercy, 17.
- Society*, Canadian Land and Emigration, 406.
- Songs*, Irish Popular, 319.
- Strickland*, Miss, mistatement in her Life of Mary of Modena, 431.
- Stroude*, Dr., his work on the Physical cause of the Death of Christ, 43.
- St. Ephraim*, Translation of his Rhythms, 501.
- Suarez*, 311.
- Sweat* of blood, instances of, 41—physical cause of that of Christ, 41.
- Swift*, Dean, his description of Irish landlords, 130.
- Symbols*, expediency of adhering to in representation of saints, 503.
- Tables*, arithmetical, 80—trigonometrical occupied the attention of the 16th century, 84—only one absolutely necessary, 90—their correctness, 90.
- Tactus*, 218.
- Tallies*, method of using them in computation, 78.
- Tenant* Right in Ireland, 122.
- Tencin*, Madame de, 199, 200.
- Terminus* Major, ruins of, 178.
- Thompson*, Mr., his answer to the controversial work of Mr. Allies, 272—failure in his argument, 305.
- Tios*, tombs at, 165.
- Tombs*, Etruscan and Lycian, 178.
- Trade*, free, 390—its importance to England, 392.
- Triquetra* found on Lycian coins, 170.
- Tradition*, how far to be the guide of Christian art, 504.
- Unity*, Catholic, its nature, 290—the Pope its centre from the beginning, 300.
- Vieta*, Francis, 84.
- Virgin*, Blessed, apparition of, 115—immaculate conception, 334—freedom from actual sin, 334.
- Via q. Vega's*, edition of, 85.
- Walmsley*, Father, 205.
- Winds*, D'Alembert's treatise upon, 202.
- Wordsworth*, Dr., his blunders in theology, 449—misquotation, 450—attributes false meanings, 453—blunders, 454—historical inaccuracies, 455.
- Xanthian* marbles, 159.
- Xanthus*, 171.
- Yanar*, or perpetual fire, 174.
- Zchokke*, Heinrich, his tales, 359.

